# LECTURES

IN-Salto Le

## DIVINITY,

DELIVERED IN THE

### UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

BY

JOHN HEY, D.D.

AS NORRISIAN PROFESSOR.



VOLUME THE THIRD.



#### CAMBRIDGE,

PRINTED BY JOHN BURGES PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY;

AND SOLD BY J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; LEIGH & SOTHEBY, YORK-STREET, COVENT-GARDEN, RIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, PAYNE, MEWS-GATE, SHEPPERSON & REYNOLDS, NO. 137, AND W. H. LUNN, NO. 332, OXFORD-STREET, LONDON; AND COOKE, OXFORD.

MDCCXCVII.



### ERRATA.

Page 7. 1. 3 from bottom, for relating, read making. 9. 1. 12. for Hebrews, r. the Hebrews. 11. lowest line but one, for Is, r. is. 13. l. 11 from bottom, for Epistles, r. Epistle. 15. at top, put 15.

16. l. 27. for his, r. the. 18. l. 3 from bottom, for alfo, r. also.

38. 1. 9 from bottom, r. circumstances.

50. 1. 7 from bottom, for aud, r. and.

56. 1, 8 from bottom, r. Whitgift.

60. l. 13. for Articles, r. Article. 79. 1. 8. from bottom, for nor,

80. 1. 3. for must, r. might. 94. 1. 7. for use, r. the use.

100. l. 3 from bottom, r. fimiliter.

-1 6 from bottom, r. Augustini.

101. l. 8. for unto, r. into.

111. l. 7 for Aticles, r. Articles.

115. l. 3. r. impracticabledesireable.

123. l. 19, 20, for it is, r. they are.

130. l. 8 from bottom, for within, r. in.

145. l. 25. for feems, r. feem.

159. 1. 7 from bottom, for they, r. fome.

161. l. 3. for was, r. were.

163. l. 21. r. opinion.

169. l. 31. r. individual.

1.78. l. 14. for this a, r. this is a.

184. 1 8 from bottom, for xvii, r. xviii.

Page 187. lowest line, r. Sect. xv 1. of Introd. to Part 11.

201. l. 13. r. Speak.

210. l. 5. for fate, r. fat.

211 & 218. r. Appello.

211. l. 23. for tenet, r. tenets.

215. l. 4. for practice, r. practise: and practised, page 396, l. 1.

218. l. 3 from bottom, for in,

231. l. 12 from bottom, r. pharisaical.

233. l. 23, r. extend. 255. 256. These numbers are printed twice.

262. l. 13 from bottom, for goods, r. good.

295. l. 16. put out the second a.

305. l. 7 from bottom, r. righteousness.

364. l. 14. for also, we, r. also, if we.

369. 1. 16. before one, infert on. 373. lowest line, for et, r. and.

376. l. 23. r. the.

377. l. 14. r. connect. 379. l. 15. for have, r. are.

395. l. 25. r. declarations.

426. l. 4. r. If I.

429. l. 7 from bottom, for this, r. the.

440. l. 8. for fenfible, r. fenfible.

443. l. 7 from bottom, r. profternantur.

449. l. 10 from bottom, for Peleg. r. Pelag.

460. l. 8 from bottom, r. Chriftian.

465. l. II. r. annulled.

- 1. 5 from bottom, r. Sect. XVIII.

Some words end with 11, which should end with 1, some periods are omitted, and some points over the letter i.

### ERKATA

The state of the s

## LECTURES

IN

# DIVINITY, &c

### BOOK IV.

CONTINUATION OF ARTICLE VI.

#### SECT. XVI.

Let us then endeavour to put ourselves in the place of early Christians, and see how writings, circumstanced as these Catholic Epistles were, might be authentic, and yet not at once universally received.

1. First, take a geographical view of the countries, in which Christianity was professed in the fourth Century: examine the extent of the Eastern and Western a Church, and you will readily admit, that a writing

a In Bingham's Antiquities, Book 1x. we have ecclefiaftical maps; particularly of the three Patriarchates, of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem; nor can it be difficult, in any book of Geography, to trace out the extent of the See of Rome, by the directions of ecclesiastical history, at any period: or that of any of the European Churches. Indeed Bingham might suffice for the present purpose.

VOL. III. A

a writing, which was to be separated by careful examination from a number of other writings, might reach fome places a long time before it reached There might indeed accidentally be a communication between one place and another very distant from it, not affecting intermediate places; while there was no intercourse between two places very near; -but, in calculating the effect of diftance, some kind of average might be taken, of communication, or intercourse. And then we might fay, if a Bishop of Sardis is obliged to travel into the East, in order to inform himself of the feveral claims of various writings, how is an Epiftle addressed to inhabitants of Judea to arrive, in its proper form and character, on the coasts of Spain or Italy?

2. We should consider what great obstructions and delays must arise from a want of a legal provision for conveyance, such as our Posts, Apparitors, &cc. and we may add, from a want of the art of printing. Some writings used to be called indeed equal by because they were to be sent round; that is, after being copied by one Church, they were to be forwarded to another: but this would be slow work; and the copy would sometimes miss its way, or stop short, or be lost. Then suppose it made a considerable progress, nay a great one; that would be nothing to the present question, which is only, why were not all our sacred writings at once universal? that they were always received in many places, cannot well be questioned.

3. Gospels must spread more than Epistles. No one could well go to teach Christianity any where,

b See Du Cange, εγκυκλια, and εγκυκλια γεαμματα, circular Letters.

Lardner gives good reasons to think, that no Scriptures have been finally lost. See Vol, 6, last Chapter.

without having a Gospel with him. Epistles of any fort would have a more confined and local reference; fo that the carrying of them to every place would not be wholly indispensible: still less needful would it be to carry round the Apocalypse.

4. Epiftles to particular Churches would fooner be acknowledged by any individuals, and fo afterwards univerfally, than Epiftles to any converts that were dispersed. Suppose, for instance, any one to ask himself whether the first Epistle to the Corinthians was to be received; and, at the fame time, whether he was to receive the Epiftle of James:—he might be fure to find the former at a known place; and many witnesses ready to vouch for its genuineness: and this certainty would have weight even at a distance, nay, at any distance from Corinth: whereas the evidence of the latter would be more scattered and feeble.

5. Supposing the progress of a writing once delayed, or its reception disputed, then, if Christianity kept spreading, the longer any doubts continued, the greater difficulty would there be found in accomplishing the end we are speaking of. Not but the writing might go on continually gaining ground; but it would be longer in becoming uni-

versal.

6. The longer the reception of any writing was delayed, the more spurious works would it have to fight its way through.—Every one of our facred pieces must have its claims set in opposition to the claims of a great many others: the more of these it has to contend with, the longer it must be in making its claims univerfally allowed: and fuch competitors would, for fome time, increase and multiply.—At any time, the Protevangelium d of

ames d See Jeremiah Jones, or Fabricius's codex Apocryphus, mentioned before, B. 1. Chap. x11. Sect. 1v.

James might retard the Epistle of James; but the more of such obstacles stood in the way, the greater

would be the retardation.

7. One principal thing to help forwards a disputed Book or writing, would be internal evidence: but, though nothing works more surely, yet nothing works more slowly: common people will for a while swallow, or rather devour, great absurdities, though after a time they will be convinced by better judges: indeed internal evidence is only evidence to the best judges, at first.—The internal evidence of the Apocalypse must work very slowly indeed. Before the completion of some of the Prophecies which it contains, it must be received merely on the probability of its being written by St. John.

xvii. I look upon these observations to be historical; though their tendency is, to shew how the controverted pieces of the New Testament might be obstructed, even if really authentic. And I should hope, that such remarks might moreover tend to six our thoughts on the growth of Christianity, and make it an interesting subject. They therefore open the subject to us, and explain its nature; and they may be called explanatory, as well as historical.—As the Article has no words about controverted Books, I shall offer no other

Explanation.

xviii. We come then to our proof:—which is only concerned with one proposition.

'The seven controverted Books of the New Tes-

tament ought to be deemed canonical.'

We will prove this of these Books, first collec-

tively, then separately.

xix. Collectively. This has been already done in some measure. Their being acknowledged upon examination, after being consounded with a number

of other books, implies a good deal: a more fevere trial than if they had met with a welcome reception on their first appearance. We might also conceive, that, had the time of their probation been shorter, this argument in their favour might have been less powerful. The want of credulity of the Fathers, in the matter now before us, like the want of belief in St. Thomas, is a very powerful confirmation of our faith.—And it must be a pleafing reflexion to any one under doubt about any of these books, to think, that its title had been examined carefully, by better judges than himfelf, when the materials for judging were much more attainable than at prefent .- Pursuing this thought, we ask how it happens, that all Christians are agreed on the subject of their authenticity? this is no ordinary phænomenon: when a point has once been disputed, it generally continues to be disputed: but, in this, there is no differing Church: nay, scarcely an hesitating individual.—To offer as a reason, that the authenticity of the books in question has been fettled publicly, in a Council, is to fay little. Those, who composed that Council, must have received conviction as private men.

I will now read to you some Catalogues of ancient times, from which it appears, when the controverted Books of our New Testament had been received amongst those always acknowledged as canonical.—And the Letter of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, to Onesimus, though only on the Old Testament, might give us a right feeling of the situation of Christians before the Canon was settled.—Cyril's Catalogue, and that of the Council of Laodicea, may be sufficient for the present. Those, who chuse to consult more catalogues, may find them in Lardner's Works, by his Indexes; or in that Chapter

Particularly Index v. under Testament.

Chapter of the Supplement to his Credibility, which treats of the Order of the Books of the New Testament.—Athanasius and Russius not only give their own opinion, but the evidence of writings now lost g.

xx. Separately. We begin with the Epistle to the Hebrews: there are two parts in each proof; we would both fee, that the work in question is written by an Apostle, and that there are sufficient witnesses of its being facred. That is, we would prove its being genuineh, and its being authentic. These two proofs may unite their force, but they are firstly independent of each other. - If a writing is proved authentic, it is to be received, whoever wrote it; if an Apostle wrote it, it is to be received on his accountk; and the evidence, that a writing is either genuine or authentic, may either be internal, or external. - During our separate proofs, the ftate of early Christians now described, as to their having a number of books claiming to be received as facred, should be constantly kept in mind.

xxI. The Epistle to the Hebrews may be proved authentic by a number of credible witnesses. Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, and Polycarp may

f Chap. xx111.

g Richardson's Canon, p. 39, 40; or Lardner, as above.

h Genuine, distinguished from authentic, B. 1. Chap. XII. Sect. 11.

i Grotius and Le Clerc think the Epissle to the Hebrews authentic, but not the work of St. Paul. Dionysius of Alexandria thought the Apocalypse sacred, and written by a John, but not the Evangelist.

k See Bishop Hallifax's quotation, p. 211, from Erasmus; though it belongs properly to the Apocalypse.

Lardner does not allow, that Barnabas does refer to Hebr. though he calls Moses a Servant (Heb. iii. 5.) and in the capacity of a servant opposes him to Christ: Barnabas does not indeed

be reckoned, as they shew, that the matter of it was familiar to them, though it is not their custom to quote formally. The force of this argument is beft feen by looking into Lardner's Credibility, &c. There, in the account of each Father, it is eafily found what Scriptures he quotes, or alludes to. And in his Supplement, the opinions of the Fathers with regard to each Epistle may be found collected. The Epiftle to the Hebrews is quoted by Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Athanafius, and Cyril of Jerusalem; and with particular attention by Origen.—We may add the authority of the Councils of Laodicea (in 364, or about that time,) and Carthage (in 397, the third.)—These authorities do not go lower than the fourth century:-but fuch as are later are useful in shewing, that all disputes were at an end. However, I will only mention Theodoret, who told the Arians, that they ought to respect this Epistle, as one which had been m read as early as the Apostolic writings.— These witnesses seem sufficient. A student, who chose to attend particularly to this subject, might read that part of Lardner's Supplement to his Credibility, which is about this Epistle in particular".

mous, we cannot perhaps be properly faid to prove its genuinenes; but we may prove, that it is written by an Apostle; which is all we have in view, in proving

deed at the same time call Christ a Son, but still the opposition strikes me: nor does any thing come near obviating it but the supposition, that Barnabas might originally have the same ideas with St. Paul. See Lard. Works, Vol. 2, p. 20.

m Theodoret begins his Preface to Hebr. with faying, that the Arians endeavoured to lessen its authority; but I have omitted relating an exact reference to the passage, from which this was taken. I may find it hereafter.

" Lardner's Works, Vol. 6, p. 381-415.

proving any Epistle to be genuine. We will now therefore offer some reasons for concluding, that it is written by St. Paul. Grotius and Le Clerc are of a different opinion; but, though they are learned men, we find ourselves obliged to differ from them sometimes.

Compare Heb. v. 12. with 1 Cor. iii. 2.—Heb. xii. 3. with Gal. vi. 9.—Heb. xiii. 16. with Phil. iv. 18.—And compare conclusions.—Christ is called Mediator in the Epistle to the Hebrews three times, and twice in the Epistles always ascribed to St. Paul, and no where else in Scripture.—St. Paul makes use of allusions to the public Games; and such allusions are sound in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

2 Pet. iii. 15, 16, is often used to prove, that Paul wrote the Epistle to Hebrews. The argument takes for granted the authority of the fecond Epistle of Peter, but that is proved independently. The reasoning I take to be this: Peter writes to the same persons, that Paul had addressed in some Epiftle of a fingular nature: fo ftrictly fingular, that it might be contradiftinguished to the rest of St. Paul's Epistles: or, what seems still stronger, to " all his Epistles," (ver. 16); now, how can this be folved fo well, as by making the Epiftle to the Hebrews to be one class, and the rest of his Epistles another?—Lardner will not use this passage, because he supposes Paul to write to Jewish converts in Judea, and Peter to converts in general. But, on this supposition, Peter and Paul would address some of the same converts:—and it seems quite clear, from ver. 15, that they did write to fome of the fame persons, whoever they were.— The

<sup>·</sup> Gibson gives more instances, -3d Past. Letter: see Contents.

P Compare Heb. xii. 1. with 1 Cor. ix. 24. and Phil. iii. 1, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Lardner's Works, Vol. 6, p. 404.

The "things hard to be understood," feem to be in the Epiftles to the Romans and Ephefians particularly; and the "as also" does feem to me to make one class of what went before, and another of what follows: and I cannot divide the writings of Paul fo well into two classes, as by supposing the Epistle to the Hebrews singly to make one of them.

In Heb. xiii. 23. Timothy is spoken of in a manner like that of St. Paul;—and one can scarce conceive any person besides St. Paul to speak of him in fuch a manner.—Such is the internal evidence, that the Epistle to Hebrews is St. Paul's: we may

add as much external almost as we please.

This Epistle is ascribed to St. Paul by many of the ancients; whose names may be seen in Lardner, and in Bishop Gibson's third Pastoral Letter. All those, who reckon fourteen Epistles of Paul, ascribe that to the Hebrews to him. Origen intended's a proof, that Paul wrote it; whether he executed his intention or not, it shews his opinion: but Lardner thinks he did execute it; in his Homilies.

XXIII. Here we may rest our direct proof, though other arguments " are to be found -The indirect proof, in the present question, is very confiderable: that is to fay, answering objections opens the fubject farther, and confirms our reasoning.

Obj. 1. If this Epiftle had fuch good evidence for it as is here faid, why was it not at first better received in the Christian world? In answer, we might first apply what has been faid about the controverted pieces in general. And we may add, it was the less readily received on account of its

Lard. Vol. 6, p. 391, &c.

<sup>\*</sup> See Lard. Works, Vol. 2, p. 472.

Lard. Works, Vol. 2, p. 478.

Richardson's Canon, p. 40, and p. 41; note.

being anonymous. If you ask, why then was it anonymous? you swerve from the present business.— It feems to have been received wherever it was known, till writings grew too numerous. In the Eastern Church, that is, in its own country, or near it, there does not feem to have been any doubt about it. At one time, it had not reached the Western Church, or not all parts of it; but afterwards it did reach them all. The high things it contains concerning the Son of God, have made many depreciate it.—The Latins would probably think it too Rabbinical for them. - And certain fevere paffages relating to Apostacy, would deter fome men, and make them wish to avoid it and keep clear of it, whether the Novatians had any concern in the affair, or not.

Obj. 2. If Paul was the author, why did he not put his name? - He might have good reasons unknown to us; and it would have been abfurd for him to affign reasons why he did not own himfelf to be the author; that would have been owning himself to be so, in other words.-Then he was the Apostle of the Gentiles"; and the Jews were much prejudiced y against him: perhaps as an Apostate. He wrote indeed to converts; but Christian converts could retain Jewish prejudices; -his reasoning with them shews, that he was obliged to turn their own arms against them, which is a fort of hostile treatment.—In this Epistle, he lowers the value of Judaism, making it only introductory and temporary; whereas many, even Christians, wanted to make it perpetual.

Obj. 3. If this Epistle was so well attested, how could some early Fathers be ignorant of St. Paul's being the Author? we reply;—Irenæus might not know

<sup>\*</sup> See Gibson; 3d Past. Letter.

y Acts xxi. 21, 28. Gibson, as before.

know the author, but he knew of the Epistle, and has quoted it. He was Bishop of Lyons; perhaps the Epistle might be less perfectly known in France than in Judea, so soon as the time of Irenæus.—
Tertullian ascribed it to Barnabas; but he also was a Latin Father: it was no bad compliment, however, to the composition to ascribe an Epistle of Paul, to his companion and fellow-preacher; to give it to one, who, if he was not an Apostle in the highest sense, was as near to one as possible.

But any one, who happened to look at the end of this Epiftle, might fay, no one must conclude that Irenæus, &c. did not know it because they were Latin Fathers; for the Epistle was written from Italy. Eyeapn ano The ITalias dia Timo Sex .-Suppose it was, when it once got into Judea, it might be as if it had been written in Judea. - But this fubscription is of very doubtful authority2. It might be occasioned by "they of Italy salute you," just before; but οι απο της Ιταλιας might mean persons in Judea, or elsewhere, come hither from Italyb.—Then, it is not likely, that this Epiftle was fent by Timothy; for the author fays, he would come with Timothy, (Heb. xiii. 23.) if he came foon; fending implies separation; and, if Timothy

In the Alex. MS, it is, from Rome.

a Notwithstanding the little credit of this subscription, Lardner is of opinion, that the Epistle was written from Rome; and there is a great weight of learning on the side of its coming from Italy. See Lard. Vol. 6, p. 413. I am not clear enough in the order of the incidents at present, to contend about the matter.—I may however adhere to what I say first, that it might be unknown at Rome, though written from a prison there.— Eusebius says, it was controverted, because not received by the Church at Rome.

b In Viger, 9. 1. 13. we have not only δι απο της 50ας, for Stoics, but δι απο της Κελτικής for Gauls, Galli.—The word αδελφοι, added in MS Veles. Is not well supported, else it would take off the force of this phrase.

mothy delayed his journey, it is probable the Epistle would be sent by some other hand.—In the authorities, Clemens of Rome is mentioned as having known the Epistle: but he might know it on the return of travellers, who had visited their brethren in the East: or as a Bishop of a great city:

—those in high authority have intelligence, which

does not reach common people.

Obj. 4. Some have thought, that this Epistle could not be written by St. Paul, because the stile and manner appeared unlike St. Paul's:-less vehement, less digressive; in better Greek than could be expected from St. Paul; and more politely expressed.-Yet we may say, in reply, the Epistle to the Hebrews is by no means deficient in spirit and energy; nor are St. Paul's other Epistles without instances of fine writing. Then, whatever made St. Paul conceal his name, would make him write with referve and caution, if not attempt to make fome alteration in his stile and manner of writing. This would naturally give a polish and foftness, and, by abating vehemence, would prevent digref-As to the Greek, I shall content myself with giving you the hypothesis of Lardner . " My conjecture," fays he, " is, that St. Paul dictated the Epistle in Hebrew, and another, who was a great master of the Greek language, immediately wrote down the Apostle's sentiments in his own elegant Greek. But who this affiftant of the Apoftle was, is altogether unknown."—Any person, who

d Lard. Works, Vol. 6, p. 410.

This was the opinion of Origen. See Lard. Vol. 2, p. 477-

of Lardner's:—if it were well grounded, the Epistle in Greek would have the air of a Translation, contrary to what is quoted by him, Vol. 2, p. 477, and Vol. 4, p. 269.—St. Paul wrote many Epistles in Greek; would he have employed any one to

who did not think himself a judge of the elegance of Greek, might perceive, that the language of the Epistle was more pure, clear and free from embarrassment than St. Paul's usually is:—it is above Barnabas, or Clement; what primitive Christian do we know of, except Paul, that it is not above?—With regard to the matter of the Epistle, good judges esteem that to be truly worthy of the Pupil of Gamaliel.

XXIV. We come next to the Epistle of James. It is entitled I αχωδε τε Απος-ολε, and addressed, according to Lardner's opinion, to the twelve Tribes, that is, to all descendants s of Jacob, probably, whether

write this for him? and, if he distated at all, why in Hebrew, to one well skilled in Greek?—As he did not write in his own name, I can conceive him to have thought more about his expressions than in his other writings; and to have consulted some friends upon them: this would sufficiently alter his style.

f See Wotton's Misna from Simon: Postscript to Preface.
E Lardner is of this opinion; see Works, Vol. 6, p. 307. In a Sermon, I have faid, it feemed to me, that St. James meant to correct the mistakes and faults of pious Christians, who had abused Christian doctrines, so as to evade the moral purposes of Christianity. I feel a reluctance to give up this opinion, though I wrote my Sermon in 1794, unmindful of this Lecture, written in 1790.—It feems to me a less difficulty to leave some expressions unaccounted for, (such as that about wars) than to suppose James to address persons so very distimilar as Jews, (supposed fixed and determined in Judaism) and Christians; or to suppose him to say things so uninteresting as some parts of his Epistles would be to Jews. - I can conceive James to have had enlarged notions, and to have feen amongst Jews perfons, who had all imaginable degrees of inclination to Christianity; and some moreover, who wanted to be both Jews and Christians at the same time. Nay, I can conceive him to consider all Jews in the light of future converts, probable or possible: or as those, whose true interest it was to become converts; but I cannot conceive him to address Jews, as Jews. He might, according to this, be unwilling to limit the number of those he addressed; but I think he addressed no one, whom he did not consider as standing in some relation to Christianity.—He might bear in whether converted to Christianity or not.—It is a Catholic Epistle, as being addressed to no particular city, or settled Church. We are not to conclude, from its being called Catholic, that it was industriously and immediately circulated all over the Christian world; probably it could only be circulated within a moderate compass.

We will first give some reasons for believing it to be written by an Apostle of the name of James, and then produce some witnesses of its authenticity. In treating on the Epistle to the Hebrews, we took the opposite method; spoke of the authority before the Author; because, that Epistle being anonymous, it seemed best to give it a credit from testimony, before we proved it to be the composition of an Apostle.

an Apostle in the strictest sense. It may seem more easy to prove this than it really is. The name of fames occurs several times in Scripture, without any mention of Parents, or any other mark to distinguish one James from another. In primitive times, there was no need of any such mark; the context was sufficient. But we have James son of Zebedee, James son of Alpheus, James the Less (µ10005), James the Lord's Brother, &c; and some of the ancients, and the Greeks in modern times, have conceived, that James the son of Alpheus and James the Less might be different persons. It will not suit our plan to enter very minutely into this

mind, that the Jews, who were imperfectly converted, might be effended, by any perversion of Christian doctrines to immoral purposes; and he might have such Jews in view; sensible that his Epistle would be read by many of them.

h Some account has been given of the four Evangelists, B. 1. Ch. XIII. Sect. 1X.

Mark xv. 40.

E See Lardner's Works, Vol. 6, p. 474, 475.

this matter. We may give some data, on which it may be folved. Any one, who wishes to examine it, must collect all the texts, in which James is mentioned, and compare them; also all those, in which the brethren of our Lord are mentioned; either all together (Matt. xiii. 55.) or separately. -If we divide the twelve Apostles into three quaternions, the order in which they occur is always the fame: the first four are always, Peter (or Simon), Andrew, James fon of Zebedee, and John. The fecond four are always, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Matthew (or Levi.) The third four are always, James fon of Alpheus (or of Cleophas), Simon the Canaanite (or Zelotes); Jude or Judas, (or Lebbeus furnamed Thaddeus), and Judas Ifcariot.—The same person has different names, we fee; but the Hebrew names might take fometimes a Latin turn, from the connexion of the Jews with the Romans; or fometimes a Greek turn, Greek being the general language: the infcription on the Cross was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.

To the above may be added, that James, the Lord's brother, is called an Apostle by St. Paul, Gal. i. 19. But after all, we must content ourselves with taking the result of inquiries made at other times. There were, then, but two, probably, of the name of James; both reckoned in all the four enumerations of the twelve Apostles. First, James the son of Zebedee and Salome<sup>m</sup>, called sometimes, though not in Scripture, major, or the elder; brother of John the Evangelist, who, with his brother John, and Peter, was present at the transfiguration, and during the agony of Christ in the Garden; who was one of those surnamed Boa-

nerges,

Matt. x. 2-4. Mark iii. 18. Luke 6. 15. Acts i. 13.

m Salome seems to have been the name of the mother of James major, and of the fister of James minor.

nerges, and a Martyr under Herod<sup>n</sup>.—Second; James the fon of Alpheus, or the less, in opposition to the other James, who is always mentioned first, and was most eminent and most employed, brother of Jude, and of Simon Zelotes, or the Canaanite, called, for some reason, or in some refpect, the Brother of our 'Lord; and by early Christians, though not in Scripture, James the just: brother also of Foses, who was not an Apostle. If our Epistle was written by either of these, it was written by an Apostle.—No one amongst the ancients, who had thought about it, denied, that it was written by one James, a man of very great eminence amongst the first Christians: - now, James the fon of Zebedee suffered martyrdom too p foon to write it; it was therefore (if our conclusion concerning the number of James's is right) written by James the Son of Alpheus. Indeed the things which are faid of James, when no explanatory title is added, and after the death of James the fon of Zebedee, are sufficient to shew, that he acted in an Apostolic character; nay, in a character higher than the generality even of Apostles, after Christ's afcension. When Peter was released out of prison by the Angel, as foon as he got into an house, he gave this orders; "Go, shew these things unto James, and unto his brethren;"—as one would send to let a ruling Magistrate know any thing, and add, 'and tell it also to the other persons concerned.' ames

n Acts xii. 2.

O As being Cousin; see Bp. Pearson on the Creed, concerning the perpetual Virginity of Mary, p. 175, Fol.

P A. D. 44.

Our Church takes part of the Epistle of James for the proper Lesson for St. Philip and St. James, May 1st.—The festival of James major is July 25th.

r He suffered A. D. 44. Acts xv. is dated 51.

<sup>·</sup> Acts xii, 17.

James' feems to prefide in making a speech on a difficult question, and what he dictates is put in execution. - James " prefides at Jerusalem; the ancients have called him Bishop of Jerusalem. James is one of those, who reconcile \* Paul and Barnabas. And his weight appears in the obedience of Peter to a commission deputed and sent, by him. - The word Arosols in the title, is in most manuscripts. And though the word Apostle, like other titles of honour, has got extended, yet the twelve feem to have been upon a different footing from the feventy, or any other disciples.—It need scarce be mentioned, that the writer of the Epistle calls himself the Servant of Christ, whereas he, whom we suppose to have written it, is called by St. Paul b and the Evangelists, his Brother. After the Ascension of Christ, James became his Minister, or Servant: he was never a strict or proper Brother, nor perhaps would he ever have called himself so; except it might be in boyhood. To the Messias, to the Lord, he was Servant; though he might be Brother to the Carpenter's Son.

What has now been faid, with regard to St. James, will make us ready to accept the evidence of antiquity concerning the genuineness and authenticity of his Epistle. Internal evidence we can expect none, except the reasonableness and morality of the composition, considered with the discretion and

Acts xv. 13. Acts xxi. 18. Gal. 11. 9.

y Gal. ii. 12.—Lardner, Vol. 2, p. 357, thinks, with Grotius and Beza, that Jews coming from James, means only coming from Jerusalem: but I hesitate:-Peter might be too familiar with Gentiles; the Jews from James might intimate this; Peter might grow more reserved to Gentiles than seemed to himself needful or right; and in that fense he might dissemble.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Luke vi. 13. Christ called his Disciples, and distinguished

the twelve " whom also he named Apostles." " James i. I. • Gal. i. 19. VOL. 111.

and amiable goodness of St. James's conduct .-His character is drawn by Lardner, Vol. 6, p. 473. Some Latin Fathers, who lived at a distance from Judea, do not speak as if they had been acquainted with this Epiftle; as Tertullian, and Cyprian: Irenæus is thought by fome to have known of it, at least in some degree .- Origen says, in the part of his works which we have in Greek, that this Epistle is ascribed to James; but, in that part of his works, which were translated into Latin by Ruffinus (if there has been no interpolation made by Ruffinus), he speaks of it as the Epistle of " James Apostle and Brother of the Lord, and divine Scriptured." If we found a MS so inscribed as our Epistle is, in any other case, we should not think of making much doubt about the author, except fome particular difficulty occurred.-But I will not dwell more upon the genuineness of St. James's Epistle, as it is attested by most of the witnesses, who come next to be considered.

xxvi. Now we may call our witnesses to the authenticity of our Epistle. They are so numerous, that I can only make a selection. The witnesses of authenticity will generally be witnesses of genuineness; conversely not so often. The earliest Fathers

c Clemens Alexandrinus occasions some difficulty. See Lardner's Works, Vol. 2, p 226. Lardner is very candid in not reckoning any of his passages to refer to James.—I do not see how to account for James's Epistle not having made its way to Alexandria before 194: but that might not be the case; Clem. Alex. might only omit James, or have no occasion to quote any passage from a writing rather moral than dostrinal; nay, one seemingly avoiding the mention of dostrines, except when endeavouring to prevent their being abused.

d See Lard. Vol. 2, p. 479.
e See Index to Lardner's Works, under St. James, his Epiftle.—And the same might be done also with regard to Hebrews, &c.—consult also Gibson's third Pastoral Letter:—Richardson's Canon, p. 42.

thers feem to have known and acknowledged what we call the Epistle of James, as authentic: Clement of Rome and Hermas are to be consulted particularly: the Apostolic Fathers were more moral than some who came after them.—Origen has been already mentioned.—Eusebius and Jerom should be added; the former of whom says, that the Epistle was known to most; and the latter, that gradually, in process of time, it obtained authority; which accounts agree with what we have said about the manner of the circulation of the sacred writings. We are moreover told, that the Epistle of James was translated into Syriac with the first of Peter and the first of John.

The particular obstacle, by which this Epistle might be impeded on its first outset, seems well assigned by bishop Gibson. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was universally received, and this seemed to contradict it with respect to justification by faith. We may add, its being moral more than dostrinal: it seems frequently of use to observe, that the Fathers were more Divines than Moralists. Lardner also mentions as an obstacle, its being thought by some, that there were more than two James's (Lard. Vol. 4, p. 253.): this is also mentioned by Bishop Gibson. Martin Luther went farther when he rejected this Epistle, on account of what it contains with regard to faith, after it had been many centuries established in the Canon.

Notwithstanding

f By the way, this is not faid about the Epistle of James as distinguished from the other artileyopera; it is said of them all, though James is specified first.

g Whitby. And in Gibson, p. 199, there is a second passage about Jerom stronger than the sirst. Bp. Gibson is not strong enough about Eusebius; γιωςιμων όμως τοις πολλοις. L. 3.

S. 25. See also Lardner, 4. 227.

h Third Past. Letter, p. 199.

See Bp. Hallifax, Ser. 7. p. 212. Jer. Jones 1. 10.

Notwithstanding this exception of some Antinomians, I shall venture to read you a passage, which Whitby quotes from Esthius, a celebrated Divine of Holland or Flanders, who lived till the year \* 1613.—With this Bishop Gibson concludes his account; and I will conclude mine with Dr.

Lardner's final opinion 1.

Epistles: the former containing the two first Chapters, the latter, the third Chapter. But, as this supposition has no support, and is formed only in order to support the notion, that this Epistle was written by Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, we may pass it over, and proceed to our proofs. Here we will first take internal evidence, then external, having, in the present case, something with which we

can compare the composition in question.

Peter, mentioned in the Gospels, was unquestionably an Apostle in the highest sense. If this Epistle was written by him, that is enough. We must be allowed to go upon the supposition, that he wrote the first Epistle of Peter, as upon an axiom: and then we may produce reasons why this second Epistle was written by the author of the first.—The names Simon " Peter do not belong jointly to any other person. No other Peter could with propriety be called "an Apostle of Christ," in any sense. The Author of this Epistle was prefent at our Lord's Transfiguration, as appears by Chap. i. 18.—He writes " this second Epistle" to the same persons with the first: (though this argument will not have weight with those, who suppose Peter to begin a new Epistle with what we commonly

Bishop Gibson seems to refer to Jerom for this passage, p. 199, but there must be a false print.

Lard. Works, Vol. 6, p. 505.

m 2 Pet. i. 1.

commonly call the third Chapter.)-In the fecond verse of the third Chapter, is a second claim to Apostleship: " the commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour."-If we take for granted the authority of the Epistle of Jude, we may prove that of the second of Peter from it; for Jude refers to the second of Peter; -I think I may fay, no less than fourteen times. And, in the 17th verse, Jude puts Paul on the same footing with the writer of what we call the fecond Epiftle of Peter; for they are the two, who speak of mockers or fcoffers to come in the last time". - In John xxi. 18, 19, our Saviour foretels St. Peter's death: in 2 Pet. i. 14. the writer fays, " I must shortly put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me."—St. Peter is faid to have been crucified at Rome in Nero's persecution; a little while before the destruction of Jerusalem: he says, P in his first Epistle, " the end of all things is at hand." John xxi. 18, 19, feems to imply a violent death.

Some reasoning has taken place about a supposed difference in regard to stile between the sirst and second Epistle of Peter. But Blackwall thinks there is scarce any difference. It is not easy to prove any thing upon this point to others; each

person must judge, or feel, for himself 9.

The

o See Lardner, Vol. 6, Chap. 18.

P 1 Pet. iv. 7.

n Compare I Tim. iv. I. and 2 Tim. iii. I. with 2 Pet. iii.
3. Yet I doubt whether Paul comes up quite to the idea of fcoffers or mockers:—" despisers of those that are good," 2 Tim. iii. 3. comes the nearest.

The fecond Chapter is lofty by containing infinuations against false teachers, and others, perhaps, pretending to take the lead in sanctity without being the best moral men: these infinuations must be the most decorous when made in allusions to writings deemed facred: but such must raise the stile: St. Paul uses the same kind of stile about the Fornicator at Corinth.

The general scope of this Epistle seems to me fuch as might have been expected in a fecond Epiftle.—Converts had used the privileges of Christianity (as some have done in all ages) as an exemption from moral obedience:-St. Paul's obscurity had forwarded this error. James was obliged to fet himself about rectifying it; and so was St. Peter in a supplementary address. With this view compare " elect." I Pet. i. 2. with 2 Pet. i. 10. and read 2 Pet. i. 1, 3, 5-11; or even to 15.-ii. 10, &c. to the end; (all about persons, who presume upon their Holiness to be vicious; Chap. iii. 11, to the end; particularly ver. 15 and 16 about St. Paul:comparing that with James ii. 14, &c. There are indeed fome things about false teachers, which might be occasioned by other circumstances; as also a presumption obviated, that, because the fecond coming of Christ had not happened already, as expected by fome, it need not be feared at all,

On the whole, we must either own, that St. Peter wrote the Epistle before us, or say, that some person forged it, intending to impose upon the Christian Church. The latter supposition is scarcely admissible, because the Author must be a good and pious Christian; and such an one would not take pains to deceive. We have indeed spoken of some, who were well-meaning, and yet did endeavour to recommend their writings and make them useful, by affixing a great name to them; but, in the present case, the writer must not only intend to recommend his Epistle, but actually to be believed to be Peters, by all Christians.—Those, who think the marks sufficient, can receive the

Salvian, &e. B. 1. Ch. x11. Sest. 1v.

<sup>\*</sup> Compare 1 Pet. iv. 7. with 2 Pet. iii. 4.—and 1 Pet. i. 9. with 2 Pet. i. 5.—and 1 Pet. i. 2. with 2 Pet. i. 10.—I could with more of these comparisons to be made.

BOOK IV. ART. VI. SECT. XXVIII. XXIX. 23

Epistle only as Peter's; if it is not that, it is not

what it pretends to be.

testimony, for the authenticity of our Epistle. Or, if external testimony at the same time proves its genuineness, no confusion will ensue. Grotius was desirous to have it pass for the work of Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, and successor to St. James;

though without any warrant from antiquity.

Clemens Romanus makes repeated allusions to the second Epistle of Peter: Hermas seems to have known it: Justin Martyr may be produced as a witnes:—Irenæus has one passage, at least, to our purpose; and one is as good as more, when sufficiently clear. Origen may be worth citing; and Firmilian, though his expression is ambiguous; it is, "Paul and Peter in their Epistles." (Lard. Vol. 2. p. 548.)—I will only add, that, though these passages afford arguments for the authority of the Epistle, silence of authors does not prove equally against it. There is no doubt about the Epistles to the Thessalonians; yet I remember observing, in a pretty long course of reading, that I never met with any reference to either of them.

After the fourth century, no more doubt re-

mained.

xxix. We proceed, in the next place, to the fecond and third Epistles of St. John.—That these should be at first neglected as minute, does not seem wonderful; even Eusebius seems to speak of them with indifference": yet afterwards, in the Council of Laodicea, Iwavve τρεις are necessary to make up the ἐπτα καθολικαι. And so long as they

were

t Grotius in 2 Pet. Lardner, 6. 565.

" Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 3. 25. Also Origen; see Lardner's Works, Vol. 2, p. 467.

were confidered as private letters to two individuals, they would be little attended to: whatever made them regarded as \* catholic, and called by that name, did probably occasion their being universally respected.—Some have understood the word \*vepia\* (2 John i. 1.) to mean \* a Church; but that does not appear consistent with what follows. If we understand the Letters, or Epistles, as intended to remedy two evils very common amongst Christians, though they were written with a view to two particular instances of those evils, they might soon be perceived to be generally applicable, and so come to be universally read, in private and public, and, in time, to be received as the injunctions of an Apostle.

In order to make the first of these two small Epistles seem natural and generally useful, we need only suppose, that some of the Docetæ had attempted to instill their notions into the mind of a devout and respectable mistress of a family:—and that she had given them rather too much encouragement. In such a case, reproof was to be applied before the disorder had got to too great an height; it was also to be sweetened by pure and unaffected benevolence. Right reproof always allows the real good qualities of the person reproved.

In order to make the *fecond* Epistle seem easy and intelligible, we need only suppose an opulent and hospitable convert, of the name of *Gaius*, to have been somewhat too attentive to a preacher,

or minister, called *Diotrephes*, who, being of an ambitious

<sup>\*</sup> The fecond and third of John were always called Catholic Epistles; see before, Sect. xv.

J See the opinions collected in Lard. Vol. 6, Chap. 20, p. 593, &c.

<sup>\*</sup> Art. 11. Sect. 1v. xxv111.

ambitious and turbulent disposition, wished to assume some authority of his own, or to abuse such as was committed to him; and, as a means of succeeding, depreciated St. John, or, possibly, his sirst Epistle: the attention shewn to this aspiring minister may be supposed to have had the particular inconvenience of causing Demetrius to be neglected; a plain, modest, orderly preacher.

In such a case, Gaius, or Caius, was to have the praise due to his hospitality; and beneficence was to be encouraged in general: the evil was to be complained of, and the offender reproved; but it need but be briefly stated; it need not be pressed, or exaggerated. Indeed the fault was properly in Diotrephes, not in Gaius; but Gaius was to be cautioned against giving it any encouragement.

The fituations which I have imagined (for I speak not as determining any thing) were probably not unfrequent about the end of the first Century; and therefore the best means of obviating their inconveniencies might be made public, and be of general concern: this they would naturally be by degrees: and these Letters would be of general use, not only to those who ran into the same faults, but to those Ministers who had occasion to check and reprove them.—They both feem, at bottom, to intend reproof for some different sorts of unsteadiness: and probably the one for yielding to Herefy, and the other for yielding to ambition. But, as I have marked out the path, by which the Student may investigate the genuineness and authority of such writings, I will content myself with referring to authors before mentioned, Lardner, Richardson, Bifhop Gibson, &c.

Lardner, I see, thinks Demetrius may have carried the Letter;—he struck me as some way opposed to Distrephes; and still does. But, as a fast, at least, I may be allowed to mention what occurred to me on reading the Epistles.

As a thing peculiar to these two small Epistles, I may just mention, that John, by calling himself the Elder, made some imagine, that they were written by John the Elder or Presbyter, mentioned by Eusebius, and not by the Evangelist; but there is every reason to think, that St. John only gave himself this title on account of his old age, and in order to avoid assuming too much consequence. He wished to appear to the devout Matron, and the hospitable Gaius, rather in the light of an elderly friend, than in that of a person, who had

authority to dictate and enjoin.

xxx. Nor, after the specimens already given, do I mean to be long upon the Epistle of Jude. The writer, by calling himself "Servant of Jesus Chrift, and Brother of James," must mean to be thought that person, who is always reckoned in the third quaternion of the twelve Apostles; and is called Jude, Judas, Lebbeus, and Thaddeus; and "not Iscariot"."—An Epistle so subscribed must be taken as the composition of him who subscribes it, if we find no particular reason to the contrary. And there is a prefumption against the idea, that a pious Christian would endeavour to deceive. was before observed, with regard to the author of the latter Epistle of Peter, which Epistle Jude means to fecond.—We might here produce evidence; Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and Origen are full in our favour:—nay, even Hermas might be adduced, if not Polycarp and Irenæus. -But, as what difficulty there has been, has arisen from

b John xiv. 22.

It appears, from Mr. Marsh's Edition of Michaelis's Introduction, that the latter gave up the authority of the Epistle of Jude. But I do not apprehend, that more will follow from this, than from Martin Luther's giving up the Authority of the Epistle of James.

from the credit feemingly given in our Epistle to fome fabulous stories, we may confine ourselves to that point.—1. Supposing the stories not true, but only believed to be true, there feems no reason why Jude might not allude or refer to them, in the way of an argumentum ad hominem. For fo doing he would have had the highest authority. 2. Supposing them true, but conveyed down only by tradition, Jude had certainly as good a right to introduce them, as Paul to introduce Jannes and Jambres d. But 3. we are told, it is possible that Jude might refer only to the canonical books of the Old Testament: and that what he says, which feems not to be contained in the Old Testament, might be collected from it, and expressed in his own manner, according to some allowed modes of fpeaking, interpreting, and applying.—The Hebrews used seigned speeches; so that one of them might give that which he, from circumstances, supposed Enoch might probably foretell, as if Enoch had foretold it'. The Rabbins, fays Grotius, use to ascribe to Angels and great men that, which might probably be faid by them.—Thus 2 Pet. ii. 7, 8, about Lot, is all supposed to be collected from the Book of Genesis.—However, it does not feem to be denied, that St. Jude may have made use of a traditional Prophecy of Enoch: or of an Hebrew book now loft. Though Jude 8, and 9, is fully thought by Lardner to be taken from the three first verses of the third Chapter of Zechariah.

If, however, we can defend the writer on the least favourable supposition, we shall have no need to apologize for him on any other. If Jude's mode of using Scripture, by putting speeches into the mouths of great personages, was known and used,

d 2 Tim. iii. 8.

<sup>·</sup> See Lardner's Works, Vol. 6, p. 619, &c.

used, it would not deceive the Jews, though it might disgust and perplex others: yet did not Livy do much the same?

Lardner, Vol. 6, thinks this Epiftle was written to all Converts, Gentiles as well as Jews: to me the allusions to Jewish writings seem too frequent

for this opinion.

is the Apocalypse—which was probably written by St. John the Evangelist, in the Island of Patmos, about the last year of Domitian's reign, A. D. 96; though not published till St. John went from his banishment there, to Ephesus, some little time afterwards,

where he prefided.

The proof of the authority of this Book will be wholly a proof of its genuineness; or that it was written by St. John the Evangelist. Such is the nature of the Book, as to make it unlikely that it should be received on any other account. Indeed Dionysius of Alexandria did hold, that it was written by another John, and in later times: Erasmus and Luther have allowed the authority, and denied the Author; but Dionysius having had a particular end in view, and the two others being comparatively moderns, they need not be considered particularly by us.

The genuineness of the Apocalypse seems capable of a most full and complete proof: as may easily be seen by looking into Lardner's Chapter on this book, in his Supplement to his Credibility.

I will

If This is not unquestioned: some have thought the Apocalypse was written before the year 70.—Some, at different times; and collected. Sir I. Newton, Michaelis, and Wetstein are all for the earlier date; but they go a good deal on the stile; the arguments for the later date seem to me much the more forcible.

g See Lardner's account of him.

b See Bp. Hallifax's 7th Sermon, p. 211.

i Chap. 22.

I will only felect a few arguments; some internal, others external.

Internal marks may be, the author's calling Christ the Word'; - and also the Lamb: his using the word Amen 1 four times; -and the phrase peculiar to St. John, of overcoming the world, or the wicked one; for being unmoved under trials .-Lardner is most struck with this last mark.

A few external proofs, or a few witnesses may be adduced. Papias, Justin Martyr, Melito, and Irenæus, may be fufficient. And what they fay cannot be collected more easily than by means of Lardner's credibility; either in the body of that work, or in the Supplement. Lardner " thinks Irenaus's testimony alone sufficient to establish the genuineness, and consequently the authority, of the Apocalypie.

Yet it must not be dissembled, that the witneffes cannot be traced down to the prefent times in an uninterrupted succession. The Apocalypse is not in the Canon of the Council of Laodicea, nor in the Catalogues of Cyril and others. Chryfoftom takes no notice of it, in his voluminous works. What may this mean?—The case seems to be, that Caius a Presbyter, probably a Roman, and Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, were determined, at all hazards, to overthrow the errors and expose the follies of those, who believed in a voluptuous Millennium; and, when that state seemed to be promised in the Apocalypse, they proceeded to leffen the authority of that Book:-their arguments,

<sup>\*</sup> Compare Rev. xix. 13. with John i. 1.—1 John i. 1. also Rev. v. 6, 12. with John i. 36.

Michaelis; see end of John; and of 1 John and 2 John. m Compare Rev. ii. 7, &c.—iii. 21, &c.—xxi. 7. with John xvi. 33.—1 John li. 13, 14.—iv. 4.—v. 4, 5.

Works, Vol. 2, p. 170,

Before, Sect. xv,

ments, together with the difficulties contained in the Book, seem to have been the real reasons why Christians began to doubt about it, even after its credit had been in a manner established. Its credit would be the more easily overthrown, at any time, as but few copies, comparatively, would be taken of it. And therefore few would be able to defend it. Nay, some doubts existed after it had been again established, in a very great measure, and these continued for a length of time: and before the Reformation, disputes being dropped, the Book had become neglected and almost progetten.

The times immediately preceding the reformation were times of ignorance; but, with regard to the more enlightened times of the fourth and fifth centuries, it has been faid, that the Apocalypse was received in the Western Church before it was received in the Eastern, contrary to what we have faid of things published in the East. This seems a mifrepresentation:—Papias, Justin, Melito, were all of the Eastern Church: and Melito, Bishop of Sardis, a Church which was one of the feven that were addressed in the Book, also went farther into the East than Sardis in fearch of canonical books. -Go lower, we have little to fay: but, on the whole, the truth feems to be, that, at first, the proofs, that St. John wrote the Apocalypse, were too ftrong to be refifted; that it made its way all over the Christian world: though Christians in general would always be attached to other facred Books in a greater degree :- but that ere long, it not only occasioned perplexity, but gave rise to error, folly, dispute: it occasioned disgust; it was opposed, laid aside:—this more in some places than in others, according to particular circumstances; but in fact it was laid afide more in the East than III in the West: nevertheless, this probably was accidental; that is, it had nothing to do with any difference between the Eastern and Western Churches.

What is said a about the Council of Laodicea seems reasonable; that they were selecting books for public reading to the people: the Apocalypse was not adapted to that use: and such is the judgment of the Church of England.

xxxII. Though we are speaking immediately of the Authority of the Apocalypse, yet its great obscurity makes one naturally say a word or two of its meaning. Many learned men have professed not to understand it: Lardner does this with the greatest plainness and simplicity. Calvin seems to have done the fame, and the learned Scaliger commends him for 'it: "Sapuit Calvinus," fays he, " qui non scripsit in Apocalypsin."-Yet Joseph Mede, Fellow of Christ's College, who died about the middle of the " 17th Century, has made wonderful efforts to explain it. And, I suppose, has been the means of our now having fo easy and pleasing a way laid open to some view of its contents, in the Sermons of Bishop Hurd and Bishop Hallifax, preached at the Lecture founded by Bishop Warburton\*. The general idea of the contents is, that it contains prophecies relating to

Richardson's Canon, p. 15. Gibson, Lardner as before: the words are, ¿σα δεί βιβλια αναγινωσκεσθαι.

Laodicea was one of the feven Churches addressed.

s Vol. 6, p. 635.

Revelation: he has left a Differtation on the Millennium. He appears to have been a candid, conscientious, and industrious man: but I am not clear that he was a man of very great penetration, or critical fagacity. He died in 1726, aged 88.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Joseph Mede is said to have refused the Provostship of Dub. lin, &c. he died in 1658: aged only 52.

<sup>\*</sup> B. I. Chap. xvII. Sect. xIX.

the fortunes of the Christian Church, which history is continually interpreting and unfolding.—A short account may be found in Bishop Percy's Key to the New Testament.

parts of our Article, it seems proper to take some notice of one expression in it; "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church;" especially as we have been just now speaking of controverted Books.

Probably, when these words were used, nothing more was thought of than the Old Testament. For the last sentence, or paragraph, about the New, begins as if nothing had been faid about it before. -And one's idea, in reading the Article, is, 'we receive all the Books of the Old Testament, which have been always, in a manner, received;—but as to those, which the Romanists receive, though the ancients speak doubtfully of them, we wish them to be read publicly, as having a good moral tendency, but we cannot allow them to have authority in settling Doctrines: so far, we think of nothing but the Old Testament:—after this, of nothing but the New. The New Testament we receive as the Romanists do.'-The words, " and new," have the air of an infertion, by way of correction.—Indeed they had better be omitted. whole phrase, " of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," is only incidental; a kind of Epithet, meaning uncontroverted:—and, if it was not strictly proper, it need not occasion scruple, so long as it did not affect the declarations, strictly fo called, of our Article: it does not imply, that we receive one book more or less.

If any one did not find this sufficient to make him easy, when he used the expression in question, recollecting

I find nothing in Bennet's Collations to favour this.

recollecting the αντιλεγομενα, he might confider farther:

1. That an Article is to be interpreted by the occasion, on which it was made: ours was made with a view to the Church of Rome; and they have never doubted the authority of those Books of the New Testament, which were once controverted.

2. It cannot perhaps be faid properly, that the Church ever doubted of the Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, &c .- individuals have doubted, but no act of the Church ever proclaimed them doubtful. The Council of Laodicea omitted the Apocalypse; but that has been accounted for: and that Council was formed only by Deputies from

the Provinces of Afia Minor.

3. Those persons may properly be said never to have doubted, who never had opportunity of getting good information. Whatever time elapsed, in any case, before Christians got sufficient evidence of the authority of any Book, during that time they are not to be considered as doubting; and, if they never doubted after they got fuch evidence, they never properly doubted at all. If a man believed the genuineness of Rowley's Poems, as soon as the proofs of it were digested in his mind, he might be faid never to have doubted of it; and, if that were the case with all men, it might properly be said, that their genuineness had never been questioned.—What time should be allowed for sufficient evidence to pervade the whole Christian world, fo that we might fay, if the controverted books were received in that time, they were never properly doubted, it may be difficult to fettle precifely, at this distance of time;—but, in settling it as well as we are able, we must take into our minds

2 Book 111. Chap. 1x.

minds all those obstacles, which have before been described.

xxxiv. We may come now to what we have called the *Application* of our Article.—We may keep up the idea of its confishing of the same parts as before<sup>b</sup>; though little need be said on any of them.

As to affenting; a person, who mentioned what passed in his mind when he gave his assent, might

perhaps fay fomething of the following fort;

'It is in vain to dispute, except we settle some common principles with our adversaries. As therefore the Romanists exalt the authority of their Church, and of Traditions in general, we must declare, that we only allow the authority of Scripture: though we grant, that whatever is fairly deduced from Scripture, has scriptural authority.— But, as different ideas have been annexed to the word Scripture, it feems best to specify what writings we comprize under that term. We receive no Books, which the Romanists reject; but some, which they hold to be canonical, we confider only as improving; and these we agree to read publicly, in imitation of early Christians, and in compliance with the wishes of those, who may have been brought up to revere and esteem them.'

'We hold the same Books of the New Testament to be authentic, which the Romanists do.'

As to mutual concessions, it does not appear how a dispute concerning first or fundamental principles

admits of any compromise.

And lastly, with regard to Improvements, those belonging to this Article are improvements in studying Scripture, and in settling the provinces of written and unwritten authority:—new proofs of the genuineness and authority of any sacred books, would

would also come under the present class of improvements: as would any new lights with regard to the ancient Jewish Books, which we commonly

call the Apocrypha.

The short rule for improving our knowledge of Scripture is, to get, as nearly as possible, into the place of those, whom it was most immediately intended to fuit: to give ourselves their ideas and feelings. It is these, which must enable us to limit and apply expressions, such as, from the imperfection of human language, are too general and extensive to be taken literally. - In order to get into the fituation of others, and learn their ideas and feelings, we must acquaint ourselves with the history of their customs and opinions; and with all the objects, natural and artificial, which most usually engaged their attention.—Fresh travels, undertaken by good antiquaries, naturalists, artists, with due encouragement, might continually promote this purpole.

And, when we could not investigate immediately the ideas and feelings of those, for whom Scripture was first intended, we might find them out, in some degree, by their effects; which are to be understood by means of Ecclesiastical History.

· See Book 1. Chap. x. and x1.

## ARTICLE VII.

## OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

New; for both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which seign, that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any common-wealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

1. Under the preceding Article, the authority of the Books of the Old Testament appeared; but it is natural to ask, do they oblige Christians? It was to Jews that they were addressed.—To answer this question properly, requires such an extensive knowledge of circumstances, and so much judgment in allowing for different situations, that it has occasioned disputes in a variety of ways.

In order to lead to some conception of these disputes, we may ask ourselves the five following questions.

1. By whom has it been faid, that the Old Teftament is contrary to the New?

2. By

2. By whom has it been faid, that "the Old Fathers did look only for transitory promises?"

3. Have any Christians ever affirmed, that "the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites," does "bind Christian men?" -or, that the ceremonial law of the Jews is obligatory upon Christians?

4. Have any ever affirmed, that the civil and political law of Moses is binding upon Christians?

5. Have any confidered Christians as free from the moral part of the Mosaic Law?

11. That the Old Testament is contrary to the New, has been affirmed.—We have already feen instances in the Manicheansa, and the followers of Marcion<sup>b</sup>. We may add the Catharists of the twelfth Century, who imitated the Manicheans .-The nature of this will scarcely be conceived without a few instances, which I will therefore read to you from Augustin's work against Adimantus, the Manichean d writer.

But let us come nearer the time of the Reformation. When we do that, we get amongst low and illiterate Sects. Before we say any thing of them feparately, let us offer a general remark.

Low and illiterate Sects interpret Scripture without regard to the circumstances of those, for whom it was most immediately intended; for it is learning, which lets us into those circumstances -- Now whenever any ancient writing is fo interpreted, it must

b 1b. Sect. xix. <sup>a</sup> Append. to B. 1. Sect. 111.

c Mosheim, Cent. 12. Part 2. Chap. 5. Sect. 4.

d Augustin's Works, Tom. 8 and 9. p. 82. e See Lard. Vol. 2. p. 413.—and Vol. 9. 187.

f John Fox, in his "Acts and Monuments," (or Martyrology), speaks first of some errors of the Romanists: one topic is, "Difference between the Law and the Gospel." - See p. 34.

g See Book 1. Chap. x. and x1.

must be interpreted too literally; without any of those limitations or additions, which, in things familiar to us, we make by means of our feelings and common fense. The Scripture, thus interpreted, contradicts itself frequently, and so must the doctrines of literal interpreters: we may, on this account, always expect to find great confusion and inconfistency amongst them. And, as they have no precise ideas, and therefore no Creeds, Catechisms, Confessions of Faith, nor any ecclefiaftical History, their doctrines will be unsteady; and fects will ramify and mix imperceptibly, keeping the same names, in such a manner as to elude all regular and fystematical investigation.—Without fuch a previous remark as this, the thinking man might be disappointed with the best accounts that can be given of Antinomians, Anabaptists, &c.

111. The Antinomians present us with an instance of what I am saying. It is certain, that Luther writes very sharply against Antinomians; it is equally certain, that Luther is esteemed an Antinomian himself. And yet those, whom Luther rebuked, were really very different from himself.— A solution of this difficulty might give us all the idea of Antinomians that we should want.

The etymology of Antinomi, or Antinomians, is plain enough: a word compounded of aut and vouces will imply adversaries of Law; and what Law is particularly meant in any case, must be determined by circumstances.

I do not conceive, that any set of Christians ever called themselves Antinomians: it is a term of opprobrium

h Fuller, wittily enough, compares low Sects to confluent finall-pox. Church History, B. 9. p. 113. they rife separately, but soon run together so as to be no longer discernible from each other. Some might add, they become only one mass of corruption.

i See Bp. Hallifax on Prophecy, Ser. 7. p. 212.

opprobrium or reproach; Quakers is also a name imposed, not assumed; but it is rather expressive of facts.—It may not be clear who first used the term Antinomians; but I should conjecture, that it might be Martin Luther, intending to difgrace the notions of Agricola, and make even him ashamed of them. I conclude this from different expressions in Luther's writingsk. Antinomus does not feem fo descriptive and confined as Quaker; rather more vague, like "lawless;" but his bold asperity might naturally use it. John Agricola, against whom he applies it, thought he paid a proper compliment to the perfection of the Gospel', by depreciating every thing that could any way stand in competition with it. Accordingly, he fet aside the Law, meaning thereby the whole religion of Moses; to which the strong things said in the Epistle to the Galatians, against the Law, might not a little contribute. Of his followers Luther fays, qui Legem ab ecclesia tollere " volunt; and in another place he affirms, that they teach, "Legem in ecclesia non predicandam"."

This term or appellation, of Antinomians, got to be used, not only amongst the reformed, but also on both sides, in the controversy between Luther and the Papists. The Polish Cardinal Hosius

1 Antinomians, and others like in this, were called Gospellers in England, at the Reformation.

m Luther's Works, Fol. 7 Vols. Wittibergæ, 1583. Vol. 1. p. 405.—like repudiandum in Art. of 1552.

k Artiropia, in the Greek Classics, seems only to mean a contrariety of Laws, as when one Law contradicts another, or is inconsistent with it: but Luther might borrow the word and twist its meaning a little on one side.

n Vol. 6. p. 222.—See also Vol. 1. p. 400, Antinemi cujusdam positiones;" and Vol. 3. 8. a sensible Differtation on reading the Law of Moses.

Hosius lays the blame of Antinomianism on Luther himself; and indeed, though Luther had made Agricola recant his errors, yet Agricola had certainly been his disciple. Luther, in answer to Hosius, says, that some Popish Monks had such contemptible notions of all Jews, that they thought the ancient Patriarchs like the modern Jewish Usurers; and that one of these Monks had said, that, so long as he had any brains, he never could believe, that Christians received their religion from Jews.

Paul Crellius a and John Maclaurin feem to have been in the same way of thinking with John Agricola.

But, when Martin Luther himself is called an Antinomian, the Law, that is the Law of Moses, has properly no concern in the matter; so, at least, I conceive: he is called so because he depreciated "the works of the Law," in order to give greater authority to his favourite doctrine of justification by Faith. Now, though in the expression, "the works of the Law," the word Law may sometimes signify the Law of Nature, and sometimes the Law of Moses, yet that makes no difference in the present case; it is merely as works, that Luther depresciates the Works of the Law;—as opposed to Faith. And indeed that may be St. Paul's sense

<sup>°</sup> See his Works, Vol. 1. p. 442. Lib. 1. de Hæresibus.

P Works, Vol. 7. Pref. to Letter contra Sabbatarios.

q Nicholls on this Article refers to Paul Crellius's Book de Libertate Christiana, but I do not find it any where. A speech of his is in the Bodleian Catalogue, but not this work.

I have, in some old papers, a remark, that this author, John Maclaurin, in a Sermon on Gal. vi. 14. (Vol. 12. p. 97.) has a notion like that of Marcion, that the Gospel could not come from that Being, who made this world. But I do not remember where I saw the Book: and now I cannot find it (1790). However, I have no doubt but there is such a book.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. iii. 20. and ix. 32. Gal. ii. 16.

of "Law," when he 'fays, that no flesh is justified by the works of the Law. If he spoke to Jews, he must mean their works, if to Gentiles, theirs: their obedience to their laws, respectively.

—But, as the eleventh Article is upon justification, we need only observe here, that, when Luther rebukes men as Antinomians, they are of that sort which belongs to this Article; when he himself is ranked amongst Antinomians, they are of the sort which is to be considered under the eleventh "Article.

The next of the illiterate fects, which we shall have occasion to take notice of, is that of the Anabaptifts. That the compilers of this Article had them in view, appears from the 4th Chap. de Hæresibus in the Reformatio Legum. Those here meant fprung up, probably, in Germany, in the heat of Reformation; -they were ignorant and furious; indulged any fancy that happened to arife in their minds from a literal and barbarous interpretation of Scripture; and by that means were a great difgrace to the Reformers, and occasioned them very great trouble. We shall often have to mention their weak notions in treating of our Articles.-Whether Pacimontanus was the first of them, as Hofius\* fays, or Stork, Stubner, and Muncer 's should be considered as their founders, is a matter of no consequence. The source is too obscure and foul for us to take much pains in tracing it out. Sleidan has written an History of them.

Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16.

\* Hofii Opera, Vol. 1. p. 431.

<sup>&</sup>quot;These forts of Antinomianism approach nearer to each other, when seen in one point of view; see afterwards, Sect. v11.

y Mosheim says, these were leaders of the factious Anabaptists: Cent. 16. 3. 2. 3. 4. but he conceives a sort of embryo Anabaptists before the Reformation.

them, which is translated into English by Bohun<sup>2</sup>: but we must not be surprized if we meet with iome inconfiftencies; nor must we think accounts false for that reason: those who declared against all war, engaged in a war particularly furious and bloody, which was called the ruftic war, or the war of the Peasants;-they might indeed be oppressed, but who, even amongst those that allow the lawfulness of war, justifies it except on principles of felf-defence? Neither must we be surprized if we find fome writers speaking of them as of two forts, others, as of twelve or thirteen, or still more. The name of Anabaptists came from baptizing adults, or from baptizing ava, over again, those who were converts to their sect, and had only been baptized in infancy: yet, what would be more striking, was their notion of Christian Liberty; of that Liberty, with which Christ had made them free: and their idea of that "yoke of bondaged," with which they ought not again to be entangled.—They not only thought, that they ought to throw off the yoke of Mosaic bondage, but of all civil government, and Law:-yet, as they could not act together without some fort of government, they got possession of the city of Munfler, and called it the New Jerusalem .- Some of them did, moreover, indulge fancies concerning

A good short account of the German Anabaptists—in Wall's Inf. Bapt. p. 414, Quarto; or Part 2, Chap. 8, Sect. 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> In 1525. <sup>b</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. Index, Anabaptists.

died in 1575.) See a treatife against Socinianism by Dr. Cheynell, p. 56; Dr. Cheynell was a Presbyterian Bigot, preserved by Parliament in 1647: Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Head of St. John's College there. Some mention of him may be found by the Index, in Neal's History of the Puritans.

d Gal. v. 1.

the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation. Those, who came over to England, were all cruelly used, though perhaps lawfully; and two were actually burnt in 1575.—Indeed Joan of Kent also, who had suffered before, in 1549, might perhaps rightly be called an Anabaptist.—Their notions concerning magistrates, war, property, oaths, law-suits, will occur hereafter.—In some things, they revived Pelagian notions.

The modern Baptists wish to be considered as perfectly distinct from these Anabaptists; no won-

der.

It may not be improper here to mention that fect, who called themselves the Family of Love; and who were, by others, fometimes called Familists. They were Mystics, (I call every one a Mystic, who professes to know how he is inwardly taught of God); their founder, Henry Nicolas, a Dutchman, who taught in his own country about 1 550, and afterwards came over into England .- That Mystics in general were considerable about the time of the Reformation, appears from the 19th Article of Edward vi; and from the Reformatio Legum<sup>1</sup>. And in 1579 the Family of Love were important enough to produce a Proclamation"; and a test tendered by privy counsellors.—They were perfecuted in a very inquisitorial manner; but fuch was the custom of the times. This perfecu-

e Art. 11. Sect. x111.

8 Under Articles 37, 38, and 39.

See B. 111. Chap. xv. Sect. x1.

f Hume, Ed. v1. Chap. 1. end. Fuller, in the Diurnal of Edw. v1. Book 7, p. 398.

h Ridley's Life, p. 344: compare Wall's Infant Baptism, Chap. 19.

k Fuller, B. 9, p. 112.

<sup>1</sup> De Hæresibus, Cap. 3.

<sup>m</sup> See Sparrow's Collection, p. 171. Fuller's Hist. p. 113.

B. 9.

tion was the reason why the writings of Henry Nicolas are published as the works of H. N.—They thought H. N. a personage not enditeable. mention this Sect as the fource of English Quakers and French Quietists; some make them the same with the Philadelphians, whom others state to have risen from Jane Leadley;—but it seems to me, that there have been Mystics in all ages; and that, when people affign a fource of known fects, they only look back till they can see no farther, and then fancy they fee to the fource.—How fuch fects spawn, it seems impossible to discern minutely .-Most fects of Mystics feem to have had leaders of weak intellects; Fuller gives an humorous account of the weakness of Henry Nicolas; and Anthony Randall shews his own weakness in that declaration, for which he was deprived of his preferment. The vicious perversions of the doctrine of Grace, which this fect ran into, must be mentioned hereafter:-we observe now only what relates to setting aside the Law of Moses;-they do not reason, like the Manicheans, on the contrariety of the Old to the New Testament, but they effect the same end: they repudiate the Old by spiritualizing and allegorizing9. Woolston used to do the same, but with more learning and ingenuity. This is not to leave what we call the Law; though we shall have to make a remark ' feemingly contradictory, with regard to the ceremonial part of the Law of Moses. But

n B. 9. p. 112.

<sup>•</sup> Strype's Whitgift, Append. p. 93, He would own no Sacraments of divine authority, because the word Sacrament is not in Scripture.

P Non est repudiandum (vetus Test.) sed retinendum, &c. Art. 6 of 1552,

<sup>9</sup> See Luther's Works, Vol. 3. beginning of Preface.

<sup>\*</sup> See B. 1. Chap. xv1. Sect. v11.

<sup>5</sup> Sect. v. of this Article.

But whoever allegorized away the part, which we think is still of importance, and established that part, which we think ought to "vanish away," might be properly enough said to repudiate what we conceive to be the Old Law. And such perfons seem to require some mention in this place.—
The Dostrina, &c. published in 1617, mentions the Mennonites as troublesome at the time of the Reformation; they are not so remote from these Familists, as to require a separate consideration.—
The Libertini seem to have been of the wilder fort of Antinomians.

We may here, by the way, observe, that Bishop Burnet feems scarcely accurate in faying\*, that this whole Article was formed against the Antinomians. It can certainly affect no fort of Antinomians but those, who reject the Law of Mojes; not those, who only have too high notions of the efficacy of Faith: and how can that part be against them, which blames the retaining a portion of the Mosaic Law; I mean the ceremonial part.—Then, it feems clear, from the Reformatio Legum, that the Article was made against Anabaptists, in some measure; -- perhaps Bishop Burnet might say, that Anabaptists were Antinomians, and Fuller, owns, that it is hard to "banke, and bound their feveral abfurdities;" -yet I think Bishop Burnet mentions, in the body of his Exposition<sup>2</sup>, some enthusiasts as aimed at, whom he would not call Antinomians in any fense relating to the Jewish Law.—But in truth it is a matter of consequence in itself, to point out both the connexion and the difference between the Old and New

t Heb. viii. 13.

u P. 19. Juel's Apology. Also B. IV. Introd. Sect. VI.

<sup>\*</sup> Burnet, Art. 7. opening. Nicholls commends Burnet's

y Fuller, B. 9, p. 113.

z P. 96, 97, Fol. P. 120, Octavo.

New Testament; and not only a matter of consequence, but of nicety; and one, which a variety of notions has given occasion to explain. Martin

Luther is very careful to a explain it.

This nicety might perhaps be the reason why some illiterate sects might reject the old Law totally:—that would be the natural consequence, if they thought rejecting it wholly was a less evil than retaining it wholly;—and were unable to adjust the degree and manner, in which part of it might vanish away, whilst the rest remained in sorce.—Such persons would find the Epistle to the Galatians very obscure; (if it did not seem to require the rejecting of the Law:) so indeed might the generality of us, if we had not had it explained by

a great Philosopherb.

IV. By whom has it been faid, "that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises?"— Promises there certainly are in the Old Testament: fome relating to temporal benefits, to a land flowing with Milk and Honey, &c; fome, which may be in a degree ambiguous; or which may denote worldly prosperity in a primary sense, and spiritual and eternal bleffings in a fecondary fense.—(See Gal. iii. 14, &c. to the end.—Luther, Vol. 3. fol. 8.)— And any thing in the divine dispensations may be deemed a promise, which excites a reasonable expestation.—How have these promises been underflood?—by some, we hold, in a sense too confined and worldly. The framers of our Article might have in view the Jews, many of whom, even though they expected a Messiah, expected him not as the Lord of an eternal Life;—especially the Sadducees: but, in composing the Article, attention would be chiefly fixed on Christians. Calvin, in his Institutes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Vol. 3. Fol. beginning. Quomodo Libri Mosi legendi sunt. b Mr. Locke.

tutes, has three chapters on this subject; and he expressly mentions the Anabaptists as his adversaries, and Servede in particular;—and as making it

necessary for him to write upon it.

If I understand their notion rightly, they tried to magnify the goodness of God by saying, that though he would freely give us an Heaven through Christ, yet that he still need not, he was not bound to do so by any promise. Promises he had made, to be sure, but they were fulfilled by the coming of Christ; he had promised us Christianity, and he had given us it; so there was an end of that matter: what remained, would come from gratuitous goodness, not from mere justice; it would be a free gift, not a payment of a debt. Thus, according to the notion of these men, the promises made by God to the Patriarchs were only transitory promises; they did not include eternity.

Calvin supported his opinion, that the promises were more than transitory, that they were endless in their effects, by John v. 24. or 1 John iii. 14. which made it look like the doctrine of assurance of suture happiness; or as if it were thought, that the heavenly state was already begun;—but he says also, that the same persons held, that God blessed the Israelites only as animals.—One would think the error described was recent at the time of the Reformation, because Calvin speaks of it sa arising

from

c Calvin, Inst. Lib. 2. Cap. 9, 10, 11.

d Vide Cap. 9. Sect. 3. Cap. 10. Sect. 1, 7. "Magnitudinem gratiæ Christi extollere vult." Cap. 9. Sect. 3.—(all in Lib. 2.) The Servetiani are one set of Christians, against whom our Articles are said to have been compiled. See Doctrina, &c. Ecclesiæ Angl. Lond. 1617.

As Hogs; fatted them well; Cap. 10. Sect. 1.—In Sect. 23, there is mention of wealth, power, a number of children, as well as of the belly and the flesh.

f Lib. Cap. 9. Sect. 3.

from what he himself had said; that Christ had sinished all his work:—It is wrong, he says, to conclude from what I said, that we are not to live in hope; that, because an offer is completed, the benefit of that offer is immediately enjoyed.

It feems as if those, whom Calvin opposes, had dwelt generally upon the opinion, that the promifes of the Old Testament were temporary, and that the purpose of such promises was, to make the Iews expect temporal rewards; and it is not improbable, that Calvin's opponents fet up the notion just now mentioned, by way of persisting, when they were pressed with arguments proving, that Christianity had been promised.—On all accounts, it became proper for Calvin to shew, that a future state appears from the Old Testament. As Patres, he mentions Adam, Abel, Noe; and he fays, that a future state might be collected from the death of Abel: Abraham was always panting after a future state. He mentions Isaac and Jacob with a reference to Heb. xi. 98. He fays, Balaam forefaw a future state, as did David; - Job also and the later Prophets. Luther also enumerates h promises made to Adam, Abraham, and Mofes.

Acontius was in England about the time when our Articles were published, and dedicated a Book to Queen Elizabeth; he came from Trent, and was looked upon as a favourer of Socinianism, and as coming between Lælius Socinus and his nephew Faustus: he is represented as leaving it doubtful whether Abraham believed in Christ.

v. Have

<sup>8</sup> See Clem. Rom. 1st Ep. Sect. 31. in Wake's Transl. p. 24.

h Vol. 3. beginning.

i I do not see Acontius in Strype's Parker, or Grindal;—he is in Ladvocat. His book seems uninteresting.—I suppose, as Cheynell says, he was afraid of speaking out: which might give a dryness and insipidity to his stile.

k See Cheynell against Socinianism, p. 38.

v. Have any Christians ever held, that the ceremonial Law of Moses continues in force under the Christian dispensation?

The very early fewish Sects of Christians did

this; but of them we have spoken before'.

m And it seems clear, that there were some who did the same at the time of the Reformation, from the latter part of the same Chapter of the Reformation. to which we have already referred.

The Book of the Familists called Evangelium Regni, mentioned in Queen Elizabeth's Proclamation, is said to hold the same of doctrine: and this sect

may be meant in the Law de Hæresibus.

Bishop Burnet p thinks, that only Jews are here to be disputed with: surely we have proved the contrary;—we may perhaps add the Schoolmen, who, according to Bishop Burnet's own account, said the Levitical Law was perpetual. How fully persuaded the Jews of later ages were of the eternity

1 Appendix to Book 1. Sect. xx1. xx11.

m There seem to have been doubts amongst Christians how far particular rules were Jewish, and how far Christian, moral, perpetual. Oaths have been rejected by some great Christian Fathers, as allowed to Jews, not to Christians. See Art. 37. Sect v; and Barclay's Apology.

De Hærefibus, Cap. 4.
 Rogers on this Article.

P On the Article, p. 125.

Mosheim, Cent. 16. 1. 3. 11: Maclaine's Note, referring to Burnet's History of the Reformation, and Hume.—See Burnet's History of the Reformation, Vol. 1. p. 38.—Henry the VIIIth's scruples about marrying his Brother Arthur's Widow.

Here is an ambiguity: the Schoolmen might retain the Levitical Law; but retain it, not as ceremonial, but as moral. Maclaine on Mosheim speaks more than Burnet as if they retained it though ceremonial. In the case of Henry VIII. Lev. xx. 21, should not be reckoned more valid than Deut. xxv. 5. merely as Levitical. Prince Arthur lest no child; was only 16 years old.

VOL. III.

nity of their whole Law, may be feen in Maimo-nides'.

Martin Luther writes to Sabbatarians.—And Strype speaks of " a Fewish Sabbath-keeping" in 1595, in consequence of Dr. Bound's Sermon; but it appears from Fuller's 'History, that Jewish is no more than a declamatory expression for very strict. However, there have been Sabbatarians (Christians I mean), who have kept the Jewish Sabbath, and on the Saturday". In Fuller, Book 11. p. 144, &c. there are three columns, expressing the two extremes, of Sabbatarians and Anti-Sabbatarians, and the mean: whence it appears, that in 1633 there were some perfect Sabbatarians. Heylin's History of the Sabbath would give more information, if wanted; and shew what very different notions have been held about it. Some ancient Christians used to keep Saturday holy, in compliance with the prejudices of the Jewish Converts, though they kept Sunday as facred \* alfo.

vi. Has it been affirmed, that the civil law of

Mofes is binding upon Christians?

In answer, we might again refer to the early judaizing Christians, and, I think, to our Reformatio y Legum, but we had better go on to something

t B. 9. p. 227.

u See Chambers's Dictionary. Sabbatarians.

r In the title of Cap. 4. de Hæresibus, we have, "aut totum exigunt," (vetus testamentum): circumcision might be the

instance, as what was the least likely to be retained.

on the 10th Chapter of the Part of the Misna called Sanhedrin. Fundamentum nonum. p. 175, Pocock. In Surenhusius, at the end of Sanhedrin. But see Bishop Chandler, p. 270, about the older Jews.

<sup>\*</sup> See Bingham, B. 20. Ch. 3. but fee also Lardner's Works, Vol. 4, p. 343, and a little before. *Tertullian* is indignant about Christians keeping the Sabbath: i. e. Saturday. Bingham's Authorities are none of them very early, though he might think the Constitutions were so.

thing peculiar:—the reformed Ministers soon after the Reformation were intent upon reforming States 2 upon fewish ideas; and our civil 2 wars shew many instances of such a turn. Dr. Balguy expresses this folly well, near the beginning of his sixth Discourse.

The Brownists might be mentioned here, a species of Puritans under one Robert Brown;—not that I know their notions exactly, but I have imagined, that, looking on the Mosaic constitution as divine, and therefore perfect, they wished to adopt as much of it as possible, in Church and State. Strype has preserved a Letter from this Robert Brown to the Lord Treasurer, from which it appears, that he thought the Scriptures, as being divine and therefore perfect, the proper source of instruction in all arts and sciences.—We have already mentioned the Anabaptists of Germany as setting

<sup>2</sup> See Warb. Alliance, p. 46; or B. 1. Chap. 1v. fifthly.

a B. 1. Chap. x1. Sect. 11.

b He is fometimes said to be of Northampton, but he had only the living of Achurch in the county, after he had given up his own sect, in 1589. His Father was a gentleman (and once Sheriff) of Rutlandshire, his Mother a Boteler of Woodhall near Hatsield, in the county of Hertford. His return to the Church has a look of great inconsistency, as he had been particularly strenuous in declaring the Church of England sinful, and, I think, idolatrous. He was probably a weak man in intellect, at the same time that he was strong in passion; turbulent and ungovernable. At last he was committed to Northampton Jail, for striking a Constable, and died there aged 80, A. D. 1630.—See Strype's Whitgist.

Life of Whitgift, Appendix to Book 3. No. 45.

d Chancellor of the University of Cambridge from 1557 to 1598: Lord Burleigh, Robert Cecil, was a relation of Brown's, and got him preferment; see Neal, and Strype, and Fuller.

e Neal makes the Brownists to be only strict Puritans, refusing all communion with the Church of England; but this letter makes the preceding notion probable. It is not dated, but by the History it seems to have been written in 1589.

fetting up a new Jerusalem, in which, probably, some Jewish civil laws would be adopted: and Luther, in his discourse on the right manner of reading the Law of Moses, mentions "quosdam imperitos et phanaticos spiritus," &c. who said, that we ought to conform to the Jewish polity; and afterwards he calls them indocti, and decepti xaxolnda, and at the same time tells us how they reason.

Civil Laws against Usury will be mentioned by

and by

Have Christians ever been considered as VII. free from the obligation of the moral Law of Moses? The answer may be given in the affirmative, merely from what has gone before; because those, who are for setting aside the whole Law, must be for setting afide the moral part of it.—But, before we proceed farther, it may be proper to fettle what is meant by the moral Law: the Decalogue? or that part which enjoins what is right h in itself?—If the Decalogue, are we not obliged to keep our 'Sabbath on the Saturday, and observe a very great strictness of rest?—If what is right in itself, is not the propofition, we ought to keep the moral Law of Moses, identical? as if we faid, 'we are obliged to that, which is univerfally obligatory.' But this difficulty is rather overcharged; because the Decalogue may be binding in *substance*, though not wholly fo as to circumstances k:-and it is not an identical proposition

f In this work, only every other page is marked: this passage is opposite Fol. 7, Vol. 3, beginning.

g Opposite Fol. 9.—Also Fol. 9, he says, there must be confusion and Sects if the unlearned will cry out to the common

people, " Hoc Dei verbum, Dei Mandatum est."

h Ephef. vi. 1.

' Something of this B. 1. Chap. x1.

k We are always supposed to be able to distinguish between the invariable esence of a Law, and the variable circumstances

to say, that whatever rules of conduct in the Law of Moses are calculated to promote the good of mankind at large, as much as that of a people situated like the Jews, those rules have the sanction of Revelation: and, where the Rules are such as have been established by reason and experience, it may be said, that the duties of morality are confirmed from Heaven.—Luther rejoices in such a confirmation.

But, though clearing up ideas may be useful to us, it does not seem absolutely necessary for our historical account; the distinction between the Decalogue and the moral Law is in fact much overlooked; and our Article does not make it necessary. Martin Luther speaks of the Decalogue, as if it was not binding as Decalogue, though we are under obligation to do every thing which it enjoins.—On the other hand, the Assembly of Divines met at Westminster in 1643, in their 7th Article revised, have these words, "By the moral Law, we understand

n which it may be executed; as in the Law of condescension executed by our Lord in washing his Disciples' feet. Other instances occur, B. 1. Chap. x1.

<sup>1</sup> The Assembly's larger Catechism, approved by the Presbyterian Parliament in England, and by Scotland, has a pretty enlarged definition of the Lex moralis; and affirms, that the moral Law may be looked upon as briefly comprehended in the Decalogue, if we take in what is implied; as prohibitions, threats, &c. The two Catechisms of the Assembly were confirmed by Parliament; but it was by the Parliament of 1647:—however, King Charles 1. offered reluctantly to licence the smaller. See Neal, Index Catechism.

m Lardner says, on another subject, "though a thing be in itself reasonable, and highly expedient; yet there is nothing that so effectually puts objections to silence, as a divine precept or precedent." Works, Vol. 11, p. 240

in Preface to Vol. 3, fol. 2, p. 2; fee also fol. 7, p. 2; (only every other page, or only every leaf is numbered in Luther's Works)

understand all the ten commandments taken in their full extent."—And the same seems to be implied in our Latin Article by the Parenthesis:— "obedientia mandatorum (quæ moralia vocantur);" this parenthesis makes the mandata seem to mean the promandments in the popular sense: but by what authority it is placed, I do not at present know. Bishop Burnet mentions the ten commandments as the moral Law; but seems to look beyond them.

If it be asked, what is the right idea of the moral Law of Moses, we answer, there need be no difficulty about it; our Article gives no definition of it: every one therefore may use his own sense. And, if we are bound to obey every thing enjoined in the Law of Moses, which is for the general good of mankind (as we certainly are), what does it signify whether it is in the Decalogue or not?—No one conceives the moral Law of Moses to be the whole of morality.—But we shall have occasion to mention the Decalogue again.—Our business now is History

The Antinomians, followers of Agricola, whom Martin Luther rebukes, being those who wished to set aside the whole Law, did not need to be here mentioned again as setting aside the moral part of it, were it not for introducing the sentiments of Agricola with regard to the Decalogue. These are not easy to clear up; but Mosheim seems

to

P There are three words in the Article, Law, Precepts, Commandments: the two first are set aside; the last retained.

<sup>•</sup> See Articles of England revised in 1643 by Assembly of Divines; in Appendix to Neal's Hist. Puritans.—See also Advice of the Assembly to Parliament, Chap. 19; and Dostrina, &c. p. 80.

<sup>9</sup> Bennett gives this Parenthesis, and mentions some copies which have two commas instead of it.

Luther's Works, Vol. 1, Fol. 400, p 2.

to have succeeded as well as might be expected in laying them together: to him therefore I will refer.—Only adding, that possibly Luther's idea of the Decalogue', as such, might help Agricola forward; though Luther blames him and others for setting aside the Law of Moses at large, in order to free themselves from the moral Law in particular.

In this point of view, the Antinomians, whom Luther blames, feem most nearly connected with those, of which Luther himself is reckoned one: and the forts feem to differ rather in degree, than in kind, when we observe them lowering the value and authority of any Law in order to get rid of obligations to good works.

It may be worth our while here to read a case, which is mentioned by Strype in his Life of Whitgift, and afterwards more succinctly in his Annals. Though Luther would undoubtedly have blamed the Antinomians or Libertines mentioned in this case, yet it seems as if his own principles, followed on to a great length, might have led into the error of rejecting the moral Law of Moses.—If any Antinomians wanted to settle the maxim, that a man, who has true Christian Faith, cannot sin, they would have to combat the authority of the Decalogue, and, in the heat of battle, would make the siercest attacks upon it they were able.

We may place here, as well as any where, the notion of the Familists, "that as many as receive Jesus Christ and his Doctrine, do fulfil and keep and

Mosheim, Cent. 16. Sect. 3. Part 2. Chap. 1. Sect. 26.

Conc. Trent. Seff. 6. Canon 19.

u P. 75. \* Vol 2, p. 451.

and do all the moral Law given by God to Moses, this seems nearly related to the notion of the later Antinomians. The words quoted are part of the affertions made and signed by Anthony Randall, for which he was deprived by the Bishop of Exeter

in 1581, of the Rectory of Lydford.

The Anabaptists have a also been here mentioned as aiming to fet afide the whole Law; it may therefore feem, that they need not be mentioned again, as defirous to fet afide a part of it: nevertheless, their morals feem to deferve particular mention. Sleidan gives an account of a man, who cut off his brother's head, in the presence of their father and mother, and perfuaded them, that God had commanded him to do fob. Those, who had to defend fuchanaction, must have frequent occasion to disclaim the authority of the fixth commandment.—In the fame history, we find accounts of the Anabaptists allowing of Polygamy, which is an offence against the feventh Commandment :- their King puts one of his Queens to death with his own hand: as he does a prisoner of war, with great coolness: reprefenting him as being guilty equally with Judas.

Mr. William Chillingworth, celebrated as a logical e reasoner, mathematician, and accidentally as an engineer, refused to subscribe to our 39 Articles; for one reason, because he did not believe the morality of the fourth Commandment d. Yet our Article

z Strype's Whigift, Appendix to third Book, No. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Reform. Legum de Hær. Cap. 4. <sup>b</sup> At San-gall in Switzerland. p. 116.

Perhaps a good Christian avould, as such, obey all the ten commandments; but yet it does not seem right to deny all authority to the Decalogue.

c See Neal, Index. In Biogr. Britannica there is a Life of him.

d This expression is in Neal; who also says, in another place, that the Assembly of Divines had been blamed for allowing in their Confession "the morality of the Sabbath."

Article requires no affent to the morality of the Decalogue in every circumstance. Any part of it, which is not strictly moral, might be set aside as ceremonial. If this great man allowed, that periodical intervals of rest, and periodical exercises of moral and religious sentiments, are for the general good of mankind, he needed not to have scrupled arbitrary modes of promoting these ends in particular cases, any more than he needed to question the morality of the fifth Commandment, of giving honour to Parents, because the reward proposed to obedience is length of days in a particular country.

But Chillingworth seems to rank with Whiston and Woolston; we may add Cheynell, in another way; men of great intellectual abilities and attainments, overheated by wrong methods of pursuing religious

knowledge.

viii. From the history of this seventh Article, we pass to what may be called the Explanation: the intention of which is, so to arrange the matter contained in it, that we need not prove any unnecessary propositions: and that those, which we do prove, may be as clear and unembarrassed as possible.

Indeed our present subject is one, which will employ our most extensive acquaintance with things divine; and require our best discretion in the management of it. In other subjects, men are different in having different feelings, and in chusing different points of view; but here, difference consists chiefly in degrees of solid, useful knowledge. God hath spoken to man at sundry times and in divers manners. All the dispensations of Heaven are to be contemplated together; and the suitableness of each to the circumstances, in which it was given, is to be taken into consideration. With regard to the Mosaic Law in particular, it should be seen,

how it fuited the times, in which it was published. how all after times; how the Jews, how all mankind. To repeal a Law of God by the reason of man, is a folemn and awful thing: what but the fear of retaining what was intended to be removed, could possibly make any one venture upon it? But to proceed to our business of simplifying.

1. Though the first proposition of our Article, "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New," feems as if it would bring on a comparison of the whole of both, yet, fince the reason assigned is, that both teach everlasting Life through Christ, they

need be compared in nothing else.

2. In order to shew, that the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, with regard to eternal happiness through Christ, we need not examine them both; there can be no doubt as to the New; we need therefore only examine the Old: and fee, whether in any fense it can be said to offer mankind everlasting happiness through the medium of Christianity.

3. As Christ has clearly brought Life and immortality to light, if we prove, that the Old Teftament promises Christianity, that Christianity which we profess, it must follow, that it promises also

immortality, or "everlasting life."

4. But, though we are only to examine the Old Testament, yet it must not be thought, that we need prove from the Old Testament, that Christ is the only Mediator; we only affirm, in a kind of parenthesis, that he is so. Moses was a kind of Mediator, but it cannot be faid, that he is one: nor indeed could he ever be properly called a mediator between God and Man; or even between God and the feed f of Abraham; but only between God and one particular nation.

5. When

c Lev. xxvi. 46. Deut. v. 5. f See Mr. Locke on Gal. iii. 20.

5. When we fay, that the Jewish Scriptures offered to mankind everlafting life by Christ, we must not be supposed to affirm precisely who accepted or even understood this offer. An offer is often made, when it is not accepted, or even understood, for want of due attention. It is no way necessary, that the Fewish people should understand every thing that is offered through their Scriptures to mankind at large. It is the Christian who is to determine whether he can fee, with the help of both Old and New Testament, that everlasting life through Christ was intimated to mankind under the old Dispensation.

6. Lastly, It is not affirmed in this Article, that a future state is announced in the Dispensation of Moses, strictly so called. If everlasting life by Christ is announced to mankind in any part of the Old Testament, that is sufficient. As it is the opinion supported in that masterly work, the Divine Legation of Moses, that Moses does not offer more than temporal rewards to the Jewish People, it feems proper to observe, that such an opinion is not inconfiftent with our Article. This Bishop Warburton bath himself proveds. Many of the Jewish Prophets, as well as the Patriarchs before the Mosaic Dispensation, nay Moses himself, might believe in Christ, and yet the People under him might only be governed by rewards and punishments of a temporal nature.—David b lived 500 years after Moses, and the Prophets considerably later, down to 430 years before Christ; during these 500 years the doctrine of a future state was dawning, and about 150 'years before Christ Bishop Warburton

<sup>&</sup>amp; See Div. Leg. Index, " Article."

h Div. Leg. 8vo. Vol. 4, p. 199.

i Creation about 4000 before Christ—Abraham about 2000 -Moses about 1500 - David about 1000 - Prophets (Jonah

Warburton owns that the doctrine of a future state

was a national doctrine amongst the Jews.

Bishop Warburton has observed a difference between saying, the Old Testament is "not contrary" to the New, and saying, the Old Testament is "the same" with the New; namely, in the manner of proposing eternal life through Christ. Two different parts of one plan may be very different, but cannot be contrary. Chrysostom seems to have had the same feeling when he says, διαφορα μουου ες το υνοματων, ου μαχη, ουδ' εναντιωσις το γαρ παλαιου εκ το καινό γινεται παλαιου. Hom. 56. Edit. Sav. Tom. 5, p. 376, cited by Nicholls on the Articles.

It may feem strange, that the omission of the sanctions of suturity should afford an argument in savour of the Divine Legation of Moses; but suppose a person to assume the character of a Law-giver, and to profess, that he would undertake to reward every one, immediately, exactly in proportion to his good conduct, with all the good things of the present world, health, long life, pleasure, riches, honours; we should say, no human power can do this; he who can act up to such pretensions, must have some supernatural influence. How could he know men's merits with exactness? how could he provide the means of rewarding them? how could he stop the ravages of the earthquake, fire, lightning, inundation? of the pestilence that walketh

and Hosea) about 800; Isaiah began about when Rome was built, 753 A. Chr.—Daniel about 550—Malachi about 430, end of Old Testament—Maccabees began about 150.

I have found it convenient to reduce the principal æras prior to the Christian æra, into the above numbers; the regularity of the divisions of time not only assists the memory, but strikes the mind as exhibiting a regularity of plan in Divine Providence: neither does it seem materially inaccurate to conceive the time of Abraham as dividing the whole duration before the coming of Christ, into two equal parts; the time of David as dividing the duration between Abraham and Christ into two equal parts: and so on.

in darkness, and the sickness that destroyeth at noon day?—And if, besides his power, he shewed a propriety in what he did, shewed that his plan was part of a wise and comprehensive scheme to communicate happiness to a great distance, of place or time; certainly our belief in the truth of his pretensions would be much more strong.—We should perceive, that such an one had a much more difficult task than one, who had only to tell his Disciples, that, if they would adhere to him,

they should be rewarded hereafter.

1x. From Explanation we proceed to Proof.— And here our first proposition is, properly, "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New:"-but. by what has been faid in the explanation, this proposition is equivalent to the following; "Everlasting Life is offered to mankind by Christ" in the Old Testament. This proposition might be proved by declarations of the Old Testament, as well as by the Types of futurity there mentioned. But, with regard to Types, they were treated in the first Book, and, in our reading of Bishop Pearson on the Creed', we find no part of our Saviour's History, which is not shewn to have been prefignified by them: and, with regard to declarations, promifes, predictions, perhaps we may as well take them into our proof of the next proposition, concerning the actual expectation of the most eminent Jews; for though it is one thing to shew, that the Old Testament does offer to mankind through Christ everlasting life, and another, that the leading Jews or Patriarchs understood such offer, and founded expectations upon it;—yet, as every proof of the offer must afford some argument for its being acknowledged.

k Chap. xvII. Sect. xvIII.

<sup>1</sup> See Advertisement to the printed Syllabus, or Heads of Lectures, 1st, 2d, and 3d Editions.

acknowledged, we may as well incorporate the

proofs of the two propositions together.

x. Our fecond proposition then is, "The Old Fathers did" not "look only for transitory promises." Who are meant by the "old Fathers" here, has been already "shewn from the Institutes of Calvin".

We are first to give some account of the Promises, which were made under the Old Testament: and secondly of the expectations, which those pro-

mises raised in the Jewish Fathers'.

First the Promises made.—Gen. iii. 15. has been, in all times, confidered as a promise of the Messiah, though one to be particularly understood only by future ages. The Scripture may be confidered as referring to it, when the Serpent, or Draco, is spoken of (Rev. xii. 9.) as having the qualities of the evil Spirit or Satan.—But to keep to the Old Testament; we have a series of promises made to Abraham, and relating to his posterity. One on the calling of Abraham, Gen. xii. 3.—One on appointment of Circumcision as a seal of the Covenant; Which is accompanied with the first Promise that Sarah shall bear a Child. Another on the dismission of Ishmael; Gen. xxi. 12.—Another on the facrifice of Isaac; Gen. xxii. 18.—These were all made to Abraham himself; -afterwards there was a renewal, to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 24. and another to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 14.-To which we may add, Jacob's dying Benediction, Gen. xlix. 10.

These, with Balaam's wagatohn, Numb. xxiv. 17. and the prediction of Moses, Deut. xviii. 15.

may

m Sect. iv.

<sup>&</sup>quot; That great man."-Lard. Vol. 11, p. 241.

o Pearson on the Creed, Article 11th, (p. 745, Quarto; or p. 379, Folio,) gives arguments to prove, that the Resurrection of the dead was revealed under the Law.

may constitute a class; as occurring occasionally in the historical Books of the Old Testament.

This class of declarations will scarcely fail to have an effect upon us, who have seen the coming of the Messiah, whatever effect they might have on

the Jews.

Another class of declarations may confift of the prophetic Pfalms, the 2d, 16th, 22d, 45th, 102d, 110th, &c; and of those Books, which are more commonly acknowledged to be prophetical.—To enter into these predictions minutely at present, so as to get a fatisfactory knowledge of them, would detain us too long. I must therefore refer to the 17th Chapter of our first Book, and to our Readings in Bishop Pearson. But it seems as if I should not pass over the information, which is given us in the New Testament, in order to affist us in our interpretation of the Old. Our Lord tells us, John v. 39. that the Old Scriptures "testify of" him; and ver. 46, that Moses wrote of him. Acts iii. 22, or vii. 37, refers to Deut. xviii. 15.—Acts xiii. 23, interprets the promises made to the Seed of David; and the 32d, 33d, and following verses shew, that the second and fixteenth Psalms were intended to be understood as prophetical. Rom. iii. 21, 22. " The Righteousness of God" is spoken of as being "witneffed by the Law and the Prophets,"-" even the righteousness of God, which is by Faith of Jesus Christ."—Gal. iii. 16. makes the Seed of Abraham, to be "Christ."-And ver. 24. informs us, that "the Law was our Schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ P." - These passages being sufficient to shew the nature of the promises made under the old Dispensation, we may proceed to the effect of such promises, on the expectations

P 2 Tim iii. 15. the old Scriptures fave through Christ. —— Here repeat Rev. xii. 9.

of the most eminent Jews, or the "old Fathers;" observing only, in consideration of our having omitted prophecies in this place, that these passages of the New Testament, even without an attempt to interpret the Old, afford the Christian sufficient reason for believing, that "everlasting Life" is, in the Old Testament, offered to mankind

by Chrift.

The negative form of expression used in our Article, seems to arise from the nature of the thing expressed: it denies, "that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory promises." It does not affirm, that they affured themselves of eternal Life, or that they had distinct conceptions concerning the nature of the Dispensation to come; it seems rather to represent them as having their minds elated, and their views enlarged, by what was communicated to them, as looking forward to something great, noble, beneficial; something which the Divine Counsels had prepared for mankind, some august and awful though benevolent plans, to which they had not for a moment the presumption of conceiving any limit.

That thele eminent men, to whom the promises were made, should have some idea of their completion, is what I find myself much more inclined to believe than the contrary;—and that is enough for our Article. Are we, from certain expressions, able to see, that promises of Life through Christ have been made, and were those, to whom they were made, totally blind to the meaning of those very same expressions?—The reasoning of our Article is the same as that which we now are using: "Everlasting Life is offered to mankind by Christ" even in the Old Testament; "wherefore" those, who were instrumental in making the offer, could not be wholly ignorant of the nature of the offer:

they

they could not be so ignorant, as to confine the benefits of it to mere earthly luxuries. - If we were to put ourselves into the place of Abraham, or Moses, or David, we could not conceive it possible.—Could Abraham receive such affurances as he did, on every great and folemn occasion, attended with so many striking circumstances, and fancy, that his posterity were only to be bleffed with abundance of milk and honey? Could Moses receive the Law in the manner he did, and govern the Jews as he did, and when, his mind full of the most sublime conceptions, he came to give intimations concerning futurity, mean some limited futurity, which he could differ the end of? its bleffings wholly to be confined to fuch a life as the prefent? this is the less likely, in the cases of Abraham and Mofes, on account of the supernatural communication, which they held with the Supreme Being. Must they not suspect, at least, something beyond the transitory things of this life?—With regard to David and the Prophets, as Prophets, the cafe feems clearer still: few will be inclined to consider them as foretelling mechanically things, of which they had no idea: yet, if we only allow, that David, and the Prophets after him, looked for any thing more than transitory promises, or even suspected any thing more, we allow enough for our Article P.

But

E

P We might ask, how could Balaam apply what he utters, by force of inspiration, to mere worldly enjoyments? He might think the fate of kingdoms a very grand thing, but do not his words, by a comparison with other phrases, bear an higher import? Balak was asraid for his dominions; Israel (and Judah in particular, perhaps, might be intended by the Lion) would overcome all resistance, and get a settled government; but, if Balaam had meant only to express this, would his extacies have been needed? would his sublimity have been natural? St. Peter (2 Pet. iii. 15.) calls him a Prophet:—but see Div. Leg. Index. Balaam.

But the authority of the New Testament must have the greatest weight. Therefore we will select a few passages relating to Abraham, Moses, and David, and then a few relating to the eminent persons of the Old Dispensation collectively.—As to Abraham, John viii. 56, seems decisive; whenever it was that he saw the day of Christ: but I must confess, that Bishop Warburton's account appears

to me not only ingenious but probable.

Gal. iii. 8. fays, that the Scripture " preached before (προευηγγελισατο) the Gospel unto Abraham, faying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed."-A man is always supposed to have some idea of what is preached to him.—Abraham was promised Christ, Gal. iii. 16. and the reasoning in that and the 17th verse seems to me to imply, that Abraham had a competent understanding of the promise and covenant made with him. How can any one be a party in a promise or covenant, without some knowledge of its nature?—As to Moses, it is not so easy to conceive, that he wrote of Christ, without any idea of him, as that he had some conception of the person and character which he was describing: and this will be confirmed, by comparing John v. 46. with Acts iii. 22. and vii. 37.—As to David, the expression Acts ii. 31. is clear; "he seeing this before, spake of the Resurrection of Christ." —Things much to our purpose are also said of the Jewish Fathers collectively: consult Acts iii. 21, 24.—Acts xiii. 32.—Heb. xi. in several places; where, though fome of the inftances may be as late as the Maccabees, others are plainly earlier; as ver. 10, 13, 16, &c .

1 Pet.

<sup>4</sup> See Div. Leg. Index; or B. 6. Sect. 5. also B. 1. Chap. xv11. of this.

It may be useful to see these proofs in a small compass.

Promises

1 Pet. i. 10—12. should also be read:—and lastly, as clearly expressing the gradual display of God's will to mankind, the three last verses of the

Epistle to the Romans.

x1. Our next Proposition is, that Christians are not bound to retain and obey the ceremonial Law of Moses. Something on this head may be deduced from the Old Testament, and therefore addressed to the Jews .- Jer. xxxi. 31-37, is a wonderful prediction; in reading it, we should remark, that Jehovah (or LORD) is the proper name of the God of the Jews; as Ashtoreth was of the' Idol of the Sidonians; or Chemosh of the Moabites:—we should also remark the internal or spiritual nature of the new Law; and moreover what is implied in God's being fet forth as superintending the Universe. This prophecy seems to denote, that, at some time or other, there would be a change: whatever be the time, change is inconfiftent with the eternity of the Law, of which some Jews have boafted. Indeed some Jews have expected a new Law

Promises made.—Gen. iii. 15. Serpent.—xii. 3. call of Abr. xv. xvii. circumcision.—xxi. 12. dismission of Ishmael.—xxii. 18. offering up of Isaac.—xxvi. 3, 24. renewal to Isaac.—xxviii. 14. ditto to Jacob.—xlix. 10.—Jacob's benediction.—Numb. xxiv. 17. Balaam.—Deut. xviii. 15.—2d Class, David and Prophets, (Isaiah, &c.)—Psalms ii. xvi. xxii. xlv. cii. cx. &c. Prophetic Books as usual.

Promises applied. John v. 39. both Life and Christ. v. 46. Moses. Acts iii. 22. Moses, or vii. 37. xiii 23, 32, 33. David. Rom. iii. 21. Gal. iii. 16, 24. Rev. xii. 9.

Expediation raised.—In Abraham—John viii. 56.—Rom. iv. 20.—Gal. iii. 8, 16, &c.—In Moses—John v. 46.—with Acts iii. 22.—vii. 37.—In David—Acts ii. 31.—In the Fathers collectively—Luke x. 24.—Acts iii. 21, 24.—xiii. 32.—Heb. xi. 13, &c. 16.—1 Pet. i. 10—12.—Conclusion—Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

1 Kings xi. 33.
1 See Div. Leg. 6. 6. 2.

·Law to take place on the coming of the Meffiah "; but others, even in early times, have flattered

themselves \* with this eternity.

It might be intelligible to the Jews, that, if their Religion were the only true one, its ritual must be temporary, because those at a great diftance from Judea could not conform to it: confult Exod. xiii. 14, 17,—and Deut. xvi. 16,—And moreover, because only the Descendants of Aaron could officiate in it as Priests. See Exod. xxviii. 1. -xxix. 9.-Lev. i. 5, 7, 8.-Numb. xviii. 7. (with the account of the Rebellion of Korah, Numb. xvi.) and 1 Chron. xxiii. 13.—Can it be conceived or allowed to be impossible, that mankind should profess the only true Religion?

Extension and universality of true Religion is inconfistent with the Jewish ceremonial Law; yet fuch extension is not only likely to be provided for, but even foretold under the Jewish Dispensation itself.—Read the 2d and the 110th Psalms.—Isaiah ii. 2.—At the conclusion of Isaiah's Prophecy, it is faid, that the Lord will take some persons " for Priests and Levites:" as also, that he will make new Heavens and new Earth, which, in prophetic language, means a new scheme of Government,

or

Isaiah lxvi. 21, 22. Jerusalem is mentioned verse 20; but may it not mean 'the true or general Jerusalem?'—the head place of worship, in any Church?

Chandler on Proph. p. 270, as before, Sect. v.
Div. Leg. 8vo. p. 470, Vol. 4; or Book 6. 6. 3.
See Lardner about St. Paul's vow: Works, Vol. 1, p.

<sup>209;</sup> but evafions are not to be put on the footing of Laws. -Or, if it should be said, that some Jews dispensed with the Law through necessity, yet it cannot be conceived, that cases of neceffity should be more common than cases, in which men could worship regularly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> See Daubuz with Lancaster; Symbolical Dictionary, p. 64: Heaven. Hurd, p. 195, Sermon 6, where the texts about making

or a new People.—Consult also Mal. i. 11.—and compare Is. xi. 9, 10. with Heb. ii. 14.—See also Daniel ix. 27. and Zeph. ii. 11.—The Jewish mode of divine worship could not therefore be

perpetual, because it could not be universal.

All the Jewish Prophecies are authentic to Christians; but to Christians it may be proved, not only that the Jewish ceremonial Law was intended to be superseded, but that it is actually superseded by Christianity.—The Epistle to the Galatians was written on purpose to prove this b; but we will take a few passages of the New Testament separately. Gal. iii. 3. may, to Christians, serve as a kind of general principle.—See also Acts xv. 24.—Gal. iii. 25.—Gal. iv. 1—10.—Col. ii. 16, 17. (or from ver. 11.)—Heb. vii. 12.—viii. 8, 13.—x. 1.

As

making an universal religion are collected; as they are in Pearfon on the Creed, p. 89, Fol.—This sense of Heavens was mentioned in our Chapter on Prophecy.

b See Locke's account.

The more Acts xv. is studied here, the better: the four things, which the Council of Jerusalem request the Gentile converts to abstain from, are not wrong or immoral in themselves, but such as would particularly hurt the Jewish converts, and perhaps bring the Gentile converts into some danger and difficulty. The Jewish converts would be much shocked to see the Gentile Christians eat blood, or things strangled, or partake of feasts on heathen sacrifices. While the Gentile Christians used their liberty in these things, it seemed impossible for them and the Jewish Christians to coalesce, to become one family or fraternity .- As to the fornication here meant, it is not the vice commonly called by that name; nor any vice; it feems, by Scripture language, to be fomething fome way connected with Idolatry.—Lardner thinks it may be making Alliances with Idolaters:—he has many texts which favour him: 1 Cor. v. 1, has not caught my eye as being amongst them. (Lard. Vol. away:"—It should be observed, that this Council of Jerusalem absolutely refused to ask the Gentile converts to be circumcised: -that was repeal enough of the Law of Circumcision, for Christians.

As there has not been perhaps any express abrogation of the ceremonial Law, Mr. Locke's three Notes on Eph. ii. 15. might here be read to advantage.

XII. The next proposition is, " the civil precepts" of the Mosaical Law " ought" not " of neceffity to be received in any commonwealth."-Instances of these may be seen in Exodus, Chapters xxi. and xxii.—It can scarce be said of these, that they are calculated to produce the greatest possible happiness of all nations, in all ages, whatever improvements may take place. Civil Laws should be peculiar to each people, and should depend upon climate, fituation for commerce, temper, prejudice, populousness, fertility, &c; they should impose no restraints, except where probable evils are apprehended. This might be urged to dfews, in order to give them an idea, that, in the natural course of things, their civil Laws must lose their propriety, and therefore their force. Indeed it is not easy to understand how they themselves can obey them, fince the destruction of Jerusalem.-It might moreover be urged, that the departure of the Sceptre from Judah and of the legislative power, was foon ' foretold: and that the cities appointed for f refuge have no longer any being.

To Christians this will have still more weight, as they are more enlarged in their notions. It is indeed so clear, that the Apostles seem to take it for granted. Compare Acts xxv. 9, 10, 25, with Deut. xvii. 8.—See also Rom. xiii. 1, &c. and Tit. iii. 1. These relate to St. Paul; who offers prudential and conscientious motives; and seems earnest to clear Christians, sometimes called Gali-

d What it is here said might be urged to Jews, may of course be urged to all judaizing Christians.

Gen. xlix. 10. Numb. xxxv. 13.

leans, from the scandal of favouring the seditious principles of Judas 8 of Galilee; - or of refusing tribute to the Roman Emperor. St. Paul uses general moral reasoning to inforce a provision h for ministers of religion; though he borrows a principle from Scripture.—St. Peter also seems to take for granted, that different civil governments are lawful; see I Pet. ii. 12, 13;—and even the different expressions of Peter and Paul seem to arise from the different forms of Government, under which those persons lived, to whom they wrote. St. Peter, writing to Afiatics, fays plainly, that they were to submit to the King, the despotic Monarch, as fupreme; -St. Paul, writing to Romans, who had a fort of Confular government in theory, and great confusion in practice, inculcates submission only to higher powers, and to powers actually fubfifting.

In Deut. xxiv. 1. we have a Mosaic Law concerning Divorces; our Saviour, Matt. xix. declares this Law to be suited to the Jews peculiarly, but to be different both from that which had preceded, and k that which was to follow: though all three of divine appointment. Our Lord may be said perhaps to have repealed the law of retaliation, as one of a severity no longer necessary; the only difficulty is, that what he substitutes is indeterminate, or a duty of impersect obligation:—however he clearly commands, that Tribute should be

paid to the Roman Emperor.

xIII. Our last proposition is, no Christian is free from the moral Law of Moses.—Here we have

See Bp. Sherlock's Discourses, Vol. 4, p. 349.

i Cor. ix. 7—14.
i Compare 1 Pet. ii. 27, with Rom. xiii. 1—7.
k Matt. xix. 8, 9.
l Matt. v. 38, &c.

no controversy with the Jews; we argue only with Christians.

If, by the moral Law of Moses, be meant those rules of conduct, which are parts of the Law of Nature, there can be no need of proof; fuch rules are obligatory without any fanction from Moses. Only fome change in human nature can repeal them ". But some have thought the moral Law meant the Decalogue, which will make it proper for us to fay fomething of the Decalogue.-However, as this distinction is often neglected, we may first make a few remarks without attending to it. - It feems plain from Scripture, that fomething of the Law was to be retained;—see Matt. v. 17, 18 ".-Rom. iii. 31.—In Rom. vii. ver. 12, 14, 16, the Law is called holy, good, spiritual;—the same I Tim. i. 8. where the inftances in the following verse are moral.—This must mean the moral Law; though any code of Laws may be called good, as a standard, of which actions fall short.—Christ, in his Sermon on the Mount, corrects abuses of the Law; that Law which is corrected, is to be continued.—No body of Laws can be totally repealed, because it must be the intention of some Laws in every code, to inforce virtue.—That mercy is to be preferred to facrifice, or moral duties to positive, when there is any interference, is a principle of Christianity. See Matt. ix. 13, and xii. 7; both passages from Hosea vi. 6. which seems to confirm our separation of the ceremonial Law of Moses from the moral.—When our Saviour tells us, that our righteousness must exceed of the righteoutness

m See Div. Leg. 6. 5. p. 375, 8vo, Note, quotation from Rimius; or Rimius's Narrative, p. 53.

n Wotton understands this to mean, that Christ as the Antitype came to sulfil the Types of the Mosaical Religion. Misna, Vol. 1, p. 304.

<sup>·</sup> Matt. v. 20.

eousness of the Scribes and Pharifees, he must imply, that we must give up no moral rule which they observed.

But, as some have thought, that the moral Law of Moses means the Decalogue, we will offer a few remarks upon that. There is a mixture of moral and ceremonial in it, which perplexed the great Chillingworth?.-Of the ten commandments, the first four relate to Religion, the fix others to the focial duties of men. The first is about Polytheism; the fecond about Idolatry; the third about Perjury; the fourth about fetting apart times for things spiritual. These four make the first Table.—The fifth is about filial obedience; the fixth about injuries to men's persons; the seventh about violation of the rights of marriage; the eighth about injuries respecting property; the ninth about injuries respecting reputation; the tenth about the regulation

of our sentiments.

All these may be called moral, though moral is fometimes opposed to religious; but there are moral duties of religion, that is, fuch duties respecting the Supreme Being, as refult from our best use of our faculties; rules of conduct, arising in the pursuit of general happines.—The fourth commandment feems moral in substance, and ceremonial in circum-Its principle is, the utility of rest or refreshment, and of periodically reviving good sentiments. Suppose this principle to operate, it would want determining to some certain modes, but so do other moral principles; as that human beings should not act for themselves, till they come to years of discretion. There might have been, whether there ever was or not, such a thing as a Sabbath in natural religion; if weeks could have got fettled by a division

P Sect. VII.

<sup>9</sup> Before, Sect. v 11. alfo Book 1. Chap. xi. Sect. v.

division of lunar months. Yet even then a good deal of time would have been requisite. Men form moral rules on perceiving, that, if such a thing was done, some good must follow: But the good of making periods of religious rest would but operate slowly.—However, if it be allowed, that such an institution as our Sabbath might have taken place on moral principles, after any time, however great, that is enough to establish the morality of the fourth commandment, as to its substance. Indeed, if we allow the other nine to be moral, it will be difficult to deny this to be so, considering the peculiar and awful manner, in which the ten were published together.

I suppose, that our Lawgivers enact the observance of our Sabbath, on the idea, that a Sabbath was ordained immediately upon the Creation, and therefore belonged to all mankind; and with a design to fall into the usual manner of reckoning time by weeks; and to adopt the practice of the first Christians in marking the succession of the new Law, and in celebrating, at the same time, the Resurrection of their Lord: induced also, in a principal manner, by the probable and the tried benefits of the Institution.

What our Saviour fays, that the Sabbath was made "for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath, together with the occasion of his remark, may confirm what we have laid down, both as to the morality

Heylin, in his History of the Sabbath, denies that it was infitituted at the Creation, or that Heathens can be faid to have reckoned by weeks.—Wotton, in his book on the Misna, opposes the opinion of Heylin, in the first matter.

s See also the renewal, Exod. xx. 10.—and all Sabbatical texts collected by Wotton in his Misna.

See Mr. Mede, Book 1. Disc. xv. p. 57, quoted at the end of Wotton's Misna.

u Mark ii. 27.

of the substance of the fourth commandment, and as to the ceremonial nature of its particular circumstances.

We have already observed, that the fifth commandment, though of perpetual obligation, is enforced by a temporary motive in the Jewish

Decalogue.

Bishop Burnet calls the tenth commandment only fecondarily moral. I would not dispute about a word, but yet the management of our fentiments is an effential part of Virtue; as will appear under the ninth Article. Dr. Balguy, in his \*System of Morals, before quoted, of which I entertain a very high opinion, has five Chapters on Sentiments.

As the name Decalogue implies ten commandments, the Romanists make ten: yet they get rid of the second, through fear, probably, of making a difficulty about their Images, and seem to divide the tenth into two. In a church about 35 miles S. E. of Paris (Moret) are the ten commandments in old French; round the chancel: "the second is entirely left out: the ninth is,—give not up yourself to the Flesh, and marry but 'once.—the tenth,—defire not the goods of others, and lye not at all." I have two prayer-books, in which the same in substance is in French verse, but neither of them contains a regular Decalogue, though one is large, and contains all the three Creeds.

xiv. All

\* Book 111. Chap. vi.

L'œuvre de chair ne desireras, Qu' en mariage seulement.

There has been a different splitting, made for the same purpose; to keep ten commandments in number, and leave out one

This is from the MS. travels of a Friend.—The lines in the Prayer-books are,

Livre d' Eglise... de Reims.—The "Necessary Doctrine," &c. distinguishes between Images, and paying them divine honors. It often goes between Popery and Protestantism.

formetimes confiderations of fitness, propriety, &c. fatisfy the mind as much as regular proofs; let us therefore enter on a few such confiderations.

So loft was the world in Idolatry, and the corruptions attending it, that nothing less than a Theocracy seems to have been capable of bringing any part of mankind to a fense of the true God; hence the Jews were put under fuch a Government; they were governed by Laws coming evidently from Heaven, and executed by men of facred characters, endued with fupernatural powers. Their minds were kept continually intent upon their God, by a number of fignificant ceremonies; they were under continual discipline, and more quickly rewarded or punished than they could be as mere men. Nothing could be better adapted than fuch a plan, to keep them from connexions with their Idolatrous neighbours\*.—And it is fuch a plan, as St. Paul might well compare to the Discipline of a Schoolmaster': when youth are formed, they must be incessantly watched and employed, encouraged, checked, rewarded and punished. The schoolmaster trusts his scholars out of his fight but little; he gives them precept upon 'precept, line upon line; "here a little and there a little:" he is more a friend to them than he feems; his ultimate views he mentions but feldom; it is distant good at which he chiefly aims;

of our ten. See Heylin's History of the Sabbath, p. 351.—or Part 1. Chap. iii. Sect. iii. Hesychius in Lev. 1. 6. c. 26. is quoted as saying, that the fourth commandment ought not to be in the Decalogue; and as splitting the first into two, in order to get rid of the fourth.—But the manner in which this is done I cannot see; Hesychius not being at hand.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> M. Luther, in his Differtation above-mentioned, (Sect. v1.) shews himself sensible of this.

b Gal. iii. 24 .- Hofea v. 2. where the Lxx. have wardeutns.

c If. xxviii. 10.

and when he punishes, it is with a view of prevent-

ing distant evil.

This account of the Law of Moses must shew it to be divine; but yet our reverence for it, and our admiration of it must be heightened, when we restlect, that those very ordinances, which were so useful at first, were also types and proofs of the subsequent

and ultimate dispensation.

By this train of thought, we may reconcile those passages of scripture, which describe the Law as carnal, with those which call it spiritual. As the Jews were to have a great number of observances, and were at the same time to prepare the way for a more perfect dispensation, it was wisely contrived, that their observances should be typical: these, as duties, would be carnal; as presignifications, spiritual.—Compare Rom. vii. 14. & 4. with Heb. ix. 9, 10. 24.—x. 1.—vii. 15, 16.—The general thought is expressed 1 Cor. dxv. 46.—2 Cor. iii. 13, 14.

Things being thus prepared, a new Dispensation might be grafted on the Old: In which the reasons of temporal fanctions ceasing, the fanctions themselves would cease, and of course the extraordinary providence necessary to support them. And an ordinary providence would take place, and men would

be directed to look forward to a future Life.

And, as we may discern propriety and sitness in the whole of the Mosaic Religion, so may we in distinct parts. Deut. xxii. 5. has been thought to be intended, not only to prevent indecency, and its consequences, but also Idolatry; as the Priestesses of Mars used to worship him in Man's Apparel, and the Priests of Venus used to worship her in woman's apparel:—the word, "abomination," βδελυγμα, has seemed to savour this Idea.

I faid,

B. ii. Ch. 7. at the end.

d Div. Leg. 8vo. Vol. 4. p. 197, 316, 366.
e More instances may be seen in Stillingsleet's Origines Sacræ.

I faid, that our Saviour had declared the Mofaic Law of Divorces to be suited to the Jews; let us now fee the particular reason of it; the hardness of their & hearts. Poets and Historians have defcribed h the Jews as rancorous and malevolent.-Since the time of Christ, they have been often perfecuted; and hatred eafily becomes mutual: But in the time of Christ, perhaps spiritual pride might have arisen from their separation from the rest of the world; from the severities seemingly authorized in some of their predecessors to the enemies of their Religion. Any kind of malevolence or rancour would make them treat the weaker fex ungeneroufly, and in an harsh manner, inconsistent with the Christian principle of "giving honour unto the Wife, as unto the weaker Veffelk.

The

f End of Sect. xtr.

Bp. Warburton ascribes the whole ceremonial Law of the Jews to the Hardness of their Hearts. Div. Leg. Vol. 3. 8vo. p. 304.

P. 394.

h Dio Cassius says of the Jews, το γας τοι γενος αυτων θυμωθεν, ωικεοτατον ες ι. 1, 59.—And see the Shylock of Shakspeare.

In 1794, I think, Mr. Cumberland brought on to the Stage a Comedy called the Jew, in which old Sheva is represented as benevolent and grateful. To appearance indeed he is a miser; and in fact lives very frugally; but he does good in secret.—We can only wish this may be founded in Nature, and ourselves endeavour to promote Christian benevolence.

i In the time of Christ, the Jews might have got some malevolent sentiments from being subject to the Romans. Being obliged to submit to persons, whom we esteem inserior to ourselves in merit, generates hatred; especially if those persons have pretensions to superiority in some respects, and treat us with contempt.

k 1 Pet. iii. 7. What St. Peter recommends is precisely Mr. Hume's sense of the word Gallantry; Essays 8vo. Vol. 1. p. 148, &c. Essay xiv. On the rise and progress of the Arts and Sciences.

What Mr. Hume says on the subject may help to illustrate the difference between Judaism and Christianity, in point of civilization of manners. And therefore to shew how ill Judaism would

The Jews were not allowed to take Interest for money, of Jews', but of frangers they were.-How far forbeating to take Interest was a duty of imperfect obligation, or indeterminate, like mercy to the poor, &c. may not be certain: the prohibition to take Interest is not followed by any specific penalty, but is expressed like prohibitions to oppress the poor ": yet, as the Jews were under a special Providence, they might be fure, that they should be punished for offences, however men might fometimes evade human Laws.—This idea brings indeterminate offences amongst Jews, under the Theocracy, near to the determinate. We may therefore endeavour to affign the reasons of forbidding Usury amongst the Jews, much as if that prohibition were perfectly determinate.

The Jews were to be a separate Nation; that Nation was to be divided into separate tribes; each tribe into separate families, and each family was to have its portion of Land, which should be cultivated by that family, and descend from generation to generation: this was the ordinary state of things: the only proper business of Jews, as such, was, to support and transmit a Religion; gain was not their business; and all arguments in savour of Interest, limited or unlimited, turn upon the right, which a man has to improve his property. Their business was, to keep the Jewish polity inviolate, till the coming of the Messiah. But though, in this ordinary course, they needed not either to lend nor borrow; yet missortunes might sometimes happen:

ıt

fuit the present times.—I could almost paint to myself a peevish Jew taking a rancorous disgust against his wife, on account of some unavoidable infirmity, and using her so, as to make separation the least evil on the whole.

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xxv. 36, &c. - Deut. xxiii. 19, 20.

m Lev. xv. 7.

if they were of a lighter fort, Brother must help Brother, mutually, gratuitously, ignorant whole turn it must be next to suffer. But, if Calamity was weighty, a family might part with its real property, in the way of mortgage or fale; only for a time; it must return at the Jubilee, every fiftieth year at the farthest. Such a scheme seems best preserved by allowing no Interest, no Usury .-Why then allow Jews to take Interest of Strangers? Here the reasons ceasing, natural liberty revived. But, would not this liberty unfettle Jews? scarcely: they would have but little to lend; being not in the habit of lending, they would be very fearful; then their Land at home would always be the great tie: what they lent to strangers would be much more to refidents than absentees; and would leave them still Jews, both in religion and politics.— When indeed their circumstances came to be very much altered, by their subjection to the Romans, by the destruction of Ferusalem, &c. they would have to judge of the grounds of their Laws, and fee how far they might innocently depart from the of frictness of them.

xv. The reasoning commonly used does not satisfy the fews, with regard to the abolition of their ceremonial Law.—Why did not Moses tell us plainly? say they. When he uses such expressions

a See Reland's Sacred Antiquities, Part 4. Chap. 11. of Jubilees.

o It has been a notion, that taking Interest for money was immoral: but such notion does not seem well grounded. It must be always wrong to oppress the needy; but oppression is a vice of the indeterminate fort.—Even in the Jews, Usury was allowed to Strangers, that is, to men, as mere men: this could not have been, if it was radically immoral. Grotius supported the opinion, that Usury was wrong (de Jure, &c. 2. 12. 20.); but Barbeyrac's Note shews, that he did not continue always of that opinion.

ın

fions as a 9 Statute for ever, a perpetual Statute, did he mean to deceive? We answer, popular, natural language will always deceive if taken too literally; but where is the fault? not in him who uses the expressions, but in him who interprets them as he interprets no others. But let us look at a few particulars, in which expressions occur, that are not taken literally by the Jews: from these, their unfairness will appear, in taking others literally. The children of David a were to fit upon his throne for evermore; that eternity has been long concluded. The children of strangers, after a price was paid for them, were to be Bond-men, or flaves, " for ever:" they could not live for ever, and any one of them might be manumitted.—" O King, live 'for ever!" might express loyalty and respect, but could never prevent mortality .- Twelve Stones were to be a memorial for ever of the dividing of the river Jordan when the Ark paffed.

The Prophet speaks of ""everlasting mountains;" and these might continue longer than the twelve stones; yet "the everlasting mountains were scattered;"—nay, "Heaven and Earth shall pass away."—As to a perpetual Statute, or "a Statute for ever," it is literally a thing impossible, because the power that enacts can always repeal. Darius made a decree about Daniel; it was immutable;—

P Lev. xxiii. 14. 21. 31. 41.

x Matt xxiv. 35.

<sup>9</sup> Pfalm exxxii. 12.

Lev. xxv. 46.
Joshua iv. 7.

Dan. ii. 4.

Hab. iii. 6.

Y See Exodus xxix. 9. The first Article of the Treaty in 1785, between the Emperor and the Dutch, agreed upon an eternal friendship between them. And our Law about the Church of England decrees, that it shall be safe "for ever."—Sherlock on Tests. Oxf. 1790.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vi. 15.

in fact, it lasted one night. From these instances, we may fee the real meaning of the expressions in question; " for ever," in popular language, denotes an unlimited futurity, according to the circumstances of the case:-" bond-men for ever," are bond-men for an unlimited time': the stones were to be a memorial, not for five or ten years, but for as long a time as fuch a memorial would naturally last. A Law is perpetual, when it is for no certain term, when those, who are to obey it, are to see no time when it will be repealed.

The Jews are against the repeal of their Law, because it is the dictate of infinite " wisdom. Yet a Being infinitely wife may himself repeal, in one fituation of things, what was made for another d. To take a Son from his schoolmaster, is as much a mark of wisdom, when the Son comes to maturity, as it once was to place him "under Tutors and

Governorse."

xvi. Our Application in the present article will be short;—if we consider in what sense any one may now affent to it, we shall do it merely in the way of recapitulation.

'Though fome through zeal, others through want of discernment, have held, that the Old and

<sup>2</sup> These bondmen for an unlimited time, who are foreigners grown poor, and unable to support themselves, are immediately (Lev. xxv. 46, 47, &c.) opposed to bondmen for a limited time: that is, to the children of Israelites, if reduced to poverty and bought by Sojourners; these last might be redeemed; and must regain their Liberty at the next Jubilee.

b Spirit of Laws, B. 3. Chap. 10 .- March 1795, The Taxes just now imposed have been argued upon as perpetual taxes: that is, they are not temporary; or for any time, whose limits are

c This Stillingfleet mentions as the argument of Abravanel, Orig. Sacræ: and Luther, in his Effay on reading Mofes. Vol. 3. of his Works; beginning.

d See before, about Divorces, end of Sect. x11.

e Gal, iii, 24. and Gal. iv. 2.

New Testament are contrary to each other, I believe them to differ only as different parts of the fame plan. If I review them together, I can fee Christianity opening gradually, ever fince the Creation. Whether the Jewish People at large were able to discern this, need not be settled: yet, from what I read in both old and new scriptures, I can by no means allow, that Abraham, Moses, and the Prophets confined their views and expectations to this Life.—When I fay, that the Old Testament is part of the same plan with the new, I do not mean, that the Laws of the former are to be obeyed indifcriminately, like those of the latter. The ceremonial and civil Laws of Moses were always intended to be temporary; though the moral Law must for ever be of force; except we may reckon as part of the moral Law fome circumstances of the Laws of the Decalogue, which feem distinct from their moral effence. These may be varied, it it be done by authority, for the benefit of any part of mankind, by whom they may happen to be carried into execution.'

As to mutual concessions of those, who contend about this Article, we need only recommend it to Jews, Antinomians, and others, to consider what has been advanced, and not to retain or reject, without a calm consideration of all circumstances.

Improvements must be of the same nature here with those mentioned under the preceding Article; they must still be improvements in studying the Scriptures. So we need not dwell upon them.

I will therefore conclude with observing what a grand and interesting employment for the mind this Article affords. Can any thing be more truly called so, than the contemplation of all the Dispensations of the Almighty, with their connexion, resemblance, difference, according to the different circumstances,

for

for which they were intended? What wonder, if low and illiterate fects should have run into various errors on a subject, which requires such extensive knowledge and sound judgement? What wonder, if the learned themselves have not been able in all things to coincide?



## ARTICLE VIII.

## OF THE THREE CREEDS.

THE Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanafius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.

I need not fay, that the word Creed comes from credo. In Greek, a creed is called magnua, γεαφη, κανων and συμδολου. The last name only, Symbol, has occasioned any difficulty.—Some have taken it in the sense of contribution, or collection, under an idea of the Apostles contributing each his share; or of Doctrines being collected into a small compass: - Others in the senses of a watchword, a badge, or a teffera or ticket of admission. Lord King fuits my notion best, when he says, it was fomething among Christians analogous to symbols, which those heathens had, who were initiated into any mysteries, in order that they should know one another, and be admitted into the place where the mysteries were celebrated. This sense may be allowed to comprehend most of the others. bols were either things to be shewn, or forms of words (Ld. King): either visible or audible.

One.

<sup>2</sup> On the word συμεολον, one might consult Suicer, Vossius, &c.—and, on the subject of Creeds, Ld. King, Bp. Pearson, Wall

One can scarce conceive a Christian church without some kind of Creed. No person could be admitted into the Christian religion, without giving fome account of his belief; that account, however short, must be a Creed.—The creed of the Treafurer of the Æthiopian Queen, was only this, "I believe, that Jesus Christ is the Son of Godb."-On this belief he was baptized; and all Creeds are baptismal confessions; or those confessions enlarged. It foon got to be thought effential to declare a belief in each of the persons of the Holy Trinity, according to Matt. xxviii. 19; but all beyond, was addition. Additions, however, became necessary, by the evafions and perversions of Hereticsd:-Whatever is wanted to preferve peace and unity of doctrine, is necessary to promote religious sentiments, and to answer the ends of religious Society. -Not but we may conceive some use of a Creed even where men are unanimous; it may be used as an Hymnf.—So long as no harm arole from it, each Bishop was at liberty to express the faith of his Church in what terms he thought proper; and fo would

on Baptism, Part 2, Chap. 9. - Nicholls on this Article; Bingham, Usher on Creeds.

Teffera was sometimes a ticket to receive a share in a division of Corn; fometimes a kind of bill of exchange; then called nummaria, (assignat): sometimes a kind of billet of a quarter-master, or, however, a ticket entitling to a reception in the way of Hospitality. Sometimes a watchword, or perhaps a fign used as a watchword.

b Acts viii. 37.

e Pearson on the Creed, Art. vIII. p. 665, 4to. p. 331. Fol. Wall, Part. 2, Chap. 9.

d See an instance (of the insertion of indivisibilem, and impas-

sibilem) Pearson on the Creed, p. 321, 4to. p. 159. fol.

e See Cyril's 5th Catechesis, p. 78. . . quoted by Waterland, p. 285, 2d. Ed. on the Athan. Creed. Ref. Leg. de Trin. Cap. 13.

The Creeds used to be called Salms. See Waterland ib. p. 50.

would suit its circumstances. Hence we have "impassible" in the Aquileian Creed;—a word di-

rected against the Patripassians.

ple and ancient Creed first; to give the History of each, subjoining such remarks, as have not so con-

venient a place elsewhere.

The expression of the Article is very like what we find in the Reformatio Legum; but I do not conceive the meaning to be, that we should affirm one creed to have been really made at Nice, or another by Athanasius. As, in the Article, we have "commonly called the Apostles Creed;" so, in our Rubric, we have "commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius." Some names must be given to the Creeds; and our Article gives them those names,

which were most ufuali.

We come then to some History of the Apostles Greed.—It is sometimes called the Roman Creed, because used in the Roman Church; yet several clauses have been added at unknown times, by unknown persons. On these, Bp. Pearson and Lord King may be consulted; and different forms may be seen in Bingham and Usher, and Wall on Baptism.—But why has this Creed been commonly called the Apostles? Our reason for calling it so, is, that some of the Fathers have called it so. Yet, they do not seem to refer to any one fixed form; which would make one think, that their calling it so was eloquence rather than History. Dr. Wall

B Ref. Leg. de Trin. Cap. 5. & 13.

The names given in English Liturgies to the Athanasian Creed may be seen in Waterland, p. 244. Note to beginning of 10th Chapter.

i A person calls the Translation of the Bible the Septiagint, who does not believe all the stories about the seventy Cells, &c. — In Ref. Leg. the Roman Creed is called the Creed of the Apostles.

fays, every thing was called Apostolic, which was done at any See, where any of the Apostles had ever presided.—(See on Baptism, Part 2. Chap. 9. Sect. 13.) That each Apostle contributed his clause, is not credible, especially as St. Thomas's contribution was faid to be the Descent into Hell; the minor James's, "the holy Catholic Church;" and that of Simon Zelotes, "the communion of Saints:" which clauses were not in the Creed till fome centuries after the age of the Apostles.—Yet it feems no way improbable, that part of this creed might originate from the Apostles, and be handed down as having been used by them, either orally, or in writing.

111. There are only two things in the Apostles Creed not treated by us elsewhere. "The holy catholic Church;"-and, "the Communion of Saints."

"The holy catholic Church" is indeed treated in Art. x xx and xx. in some fort; so that we need only speak of it here as part of a Creed. Ld. King fays', that this clause is first found in Tertullian, or rather, some part of it; for it came into the creed gradually; in this order, as I conceive; "the Church," "the holy church," "the holy catholic church." The reason of inserting it is not clearly Probably, it might be inferted in order to known. discourage Herely, to unite Christians for their common credit and support; or to give weight to large bodies of Catholics affembled in councils, or to those, who were most fit to dictate or govern, though living separate from each other.

"The communion of Saints." ... 1 think Bp. Pearson says, that this clause was inserted last.

k See also Book 1. Chap. x1x. Sect. xv1. and Book 111. Chap. x1. Sect. 1v. P. 324.

And Lord King, that it was introduced by Augustin with a view to the Donatists, who refused to hold communion with other Bodies of Christians.—So that, in the primary sense, he who believed the communion of Saints, believed that all Christians (called Saints in Scripture) ought to communicate with each other, though they belonged to different particular societies; that they should all be interested for the rest, and have a religious patriotism.

The "Necessary Doctrine," &c. makes the communion of Christians, (the members of Christ's Body,) to be like the communion of the members of the natural body; such that the nourishment, which is given to the Body, benefits every member. "In so muche that it lieth not in the power of any manne to saie, that the meate whiche he putteth into his owne mouthe, shall nourish one particular membre of his bodie and not an other."

Yet to some, this clause has seemed to imply a common feeling, not only between cotemporaries, but also between Christians of all different ages and generations.—That fuch an idea is not without tome foundation in Scripture, feems evident from feveral passages. Successive generations are baptized in one form; Christ is with his churchaunto the end of the world; he prays (John xvii. 20.) for all his disciples without distinction of times; he was the Lamb flain from the foundation of the world; and "if we walk in the light as God is in the light, we have fellowship (or communion, κοινωνιαν) one with another, and the blood of Jefus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all Sin." I John i. 7.—the Holy Spirit guides men into all truth: these things must unite Christians to make a common interest; nor does departure out of this life make any interruption in the views of the good Christian:

Christian: there is still, for any friend he has lost, or for himself, "the heavenly Jerusalem," "the general affembly and church of the first-born," and "the spirits of just men " made perfect."-

" Forgiveness of Sins" is treated under the fixteenth Article.

v. In treating of the Nicene Creed, the same method may be used.

The common notion is, that this Creed, as far as the words " Holy Ghoft," was made at the Council of Nice, or Nicæa, in Bithynia, in 325; and that the remainder was added at Constantinople, in a general Council, in 381, or 382.—The Nicena Council is often called the Council of 318; Beaufobre fupposes, that though there might be about 300 Bishops present, the precise number 318 was borrowed from Gen. xiv. 14. about the 318 fervantso of Abraham, by whom he overcame his enemies.—This Council was mentioned before; it was held on account of the disputes about Easter, and the Doctrine of Arius; and the Meletian Schifm, relating probably to Ordinations.-The shorter Creed may be compared with the fuller in Books of Councils, the shorter is in Dr. Rutherforth's fourth Charge, and Archbishop Usher's Differtation on Creeds; but they both feem to trust to the Liturgy for the longer. Waterland calls it "the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed."

Archbishop

m Heb. xii. 23.

a Lardner's account of the Council of Nice makes a Chapter in his Credibility, &c. Works, Vol. 4. p. 187.

<sup>·</sup> See Pearson on the Creed about the Cross, beginning of " was crucified."

P Labbé, Vol. 3. col. 27. 951.

Rutherforth's Charges, p. 83.

Symbolum autem hoc quod in divinorum mysteriorum administratione recitatur, &c. Usher p. 16.—Yet he says, his form from Epiphanius, is very near that of Constantinople in 381.

<sup>.</sup> Hift. Athan. Creed p. 161, 2d. Edit.

Archbishop Usher was, at one time, of the common opinion, but afterwards thought (as I understand), that the whole of our Nicene Creed was known at Nice in 325, though no more was published than what relates to Arius': the part published he looked upon as recital" of fo much of the Creeds then in use, as was to the purpose of the meeting: the remainder being eafily supplied from other Creeds, when wanted. What made him change his opinion was, finding, in writings composed between 325 and 381, the substance of the last paragraph of that Creed, which we use, and commonly call Nicene; and quoted as the doctrine of the Nicene Fathers .- Yet there might be doctrines professed by the Nicene Fathers, which were not inferted into any Creeds at the time of the Council of Nice.

We now proceed to remark on those parts of our Nicene Creed, which have not before been treated, nor are likely to find a more convenient place hereafter.

vi. "Light of Light," that is, "I believe" in Christ, "begotten of his Father," "God of God;"—and I am willing to acknowledge the propriety of this expression or comparison, "Light of light." Now, one does not see how this can appear an improper expression, even to an Arian or a Socinian; for both the Father and the Son are called Light in Scripture\*. The expression is in fact used be-

t Yet did not Arius reckon the Holy Ghost "creaturam creaturæ?"—Epiphan. Hær. 69, treats of Arius. And see Aug. Hær. 49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>u</sup> Dr. Rutherforth maintains the fame opinion. See his Charges, p. 84.

Charges, p. 84.

But see Lord King, p. 319, from Epiphanius; quoted before; where the Macedonians about 360 boast, that they received the Whole Nicene Creed.—See also Wall 4to. p. 503.

<sup>\*</sup> See Cruden's Concordance, Light, or John i. 5. and John

cause it seems to contain an illustration of the eternal generation of the Son of God, likely to reconcile different parties. The Father is the Light as the tuminary, the Son is the Light as the effulgence, or emanation: the fun-beams are coeval with the luminous body; they are inseparable, or of the same Substance, and yet distinct. The word anauyaouay, in the opening of the Epiftle to the Hebrews, has given occasion to this illustration; it seems to have been adopted with pleasure by men so eminent as Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria, before the Council of Nice, and about that time by Athanafius'. - Every illustration must, in such a case, be inadequate, but he, at least, who scruples not to use the words, "God of God," need not scruple to use the expression " Light of Light."

vii. In the fifth Article, though we proved feveral propositions concerning the Holy Ghost, the expressions of that Article did not lead us to prove, that he might with propriety be called "Lord," and "giver of Life;" το χυριον και το ζωοποιών, (not Lord of Life), though we used some texts, from which that might be proved. These expressions were used, no doubt, in opposition to the degrading notions of Arians and Macedonians.

The Church might think themselves authorized to call the Holy Ghost "Lord," from a comparison of Acts i. 16, with Acts iv. 24;—and from a comparison between Exodus xxxvi. 34, and 2 Cor. iii. 17; the word xveros being used in its highest sense in the former, and used of the Holy Ghost in the

y Heb. i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> See Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, απαυγασμα.

To region must be an adjective, agreeing with writer. but region feems sometimes substantive, sometimes adjective, and sometimes a substantive put as an adjective; in the manner in which we say, a Master-Key.—The proof must be the same, as if the Greek was a substantive as well as the English.

the latter, in speaking of one and the same fact. Also from 1 Theff. iii. 12, 13, where the three per-

fons of the Trinity are enumerated.

The council (of Nice, or Constantinople,) might call the Holy Ghost " giver of Life," from Rom viii. 10, 11.—1 Pet. iii. 18.—and indeed from Rev. xxii. 1,—if the enumeration of the three perfons of the Trinity, and the " proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb" were noticed.

as b well as the word " Life."

And though, when it is faid, "the Spirit giveth Life," 2 Cor. iii. 6., and "it is the Spirit that quickeneth," John vi. 63, Spirit may be opposed to Letter, or Body; yet these expressions seem to me to imply a fort of general maxim, that whatever, in any fense, can be called Spirit, must be conceived as giving Life to that, of which it is the Spirit.

The Church might deduce the expression, " who spake by the Prophets," from Acts i. 16 .- And

1 Pet. i. 10, 11.

The propriety of these several expressions in their feveral places, would probably appear from a diligent and accurate attention to the circumstances, in

which they were introduced.

VIII. We now come to the Athanasian Creed. This was not always called a Creed, nor, when it was fo called, was it always named Athanasian. has been called Fides Catholica, Sermo fidei catholicæ, Fides quicunque vult, Psalmus quicunque vult, Sermo Athanafii de Fide, Expositio Catholicæ fidei Athanasii, &c. &c. It was not called Athanasian till near the end of the seventh Century, and then it might be called fo as containing his Opinions.

Ver. 1-4 of Rev. xxii. might be all read.

See Waterland's History of this Composition, p. 121, 2d. Edit. and p. 89.

Opinions. Athanasius flourished in 326, and died about 373: Yet some have thought it the composition of Athanasius; nay, such eminent men as Baronius, Allatius, and Bp. Andrews.

It has been thought to have been composed by Hilary, a French Bishop, about the year 430, for use of the Gallican Clergy; this was the opinion of Dr. Waterland.

Several writers have thought, that it was written by Vigilius Tapsensis, that is, Bishop of Tapsum, or Tapsus, in the Byzacene, a region of Africa; about the year 484.

Some give only a doubtful or a negative judgment; faying the Author was "a Latin Author,"—" a Gallican writer,"—" doubtful,"—" not Athanafius."—And some have affigned Athanasius of Spire as the Author, before the middle of the seventh Century.—Bishop Pearson says, "a Latin author, and one later than the samous Athanasius."

Dr. Waterland has written a very able book on this subject; he seems to have consulted all authorities, as a learned man ought to do. His MS. copies amounted to 74, and the authors, ancient and modern, to a much larger number. When he has given accounts of what information he has met with, he forms his recapitulations into tables, which are very useful in exhibiting a subject at one view.

As far as my reading goes, it inclines me to agree with this respectable writer;—therefore it seems necessary to take notice of one difficulty; the Creed opposes

This opinion is adopted by Mr. Gibbon, Hist. Vol. 3. p. 544, quarto; whose decision is said, by the Author of a pamphlet entitled "Hints," &c. to be "acknowledged by all." See Bingham, 10. 4. 18.

e See Waterland p. 24.

f Creed, p. 324. Fol. p. 647. 4to.

opposes the Nestorian and Eutychian doctrines; the former were condemned at Ephesus in 431; the latter at Chalcedon in 451; yet Waterland supposes the creed to have been composed about the year 430. We have had difficulties similar to this before; the general solution is, that doctrines have been often disseminated, or have even grown up so as to be very troublesome, before those by whom they are professed have acquired that name by which, as a sect, they are denominated in History. Waterland mentions the Apollinarians, as having held a doctrine nearly the same with that of Eutyches; and the Nestorian doctrines were well known in 430.

It must not be thought inaccurate to speak of doctrines by their usual names, taken from those sects which were the most famous for professing them, though with reference to a time before those

names were imposed.

It seems agreed, that the original language of the Creed in question was Latin; though there are several Greek MSS. of it: this is so generally acknowledged, that even those, who ascribe it to Athanasius, say, that he wrote it in Latin, when he was at Rome, or in Germany.

Comments on this creed have been made not unfrequently: at first, none were wanted;—as it contains nothing but what was to be found in the writings of the Fathers, the expressions and allusions were understood; but afterwards, comments were useful; some were made towards the end of

the

Familists, though aimed at in 1562, had scarce their name till near 1579.—Of the Socinians it has, I think, been said, that their doctrines were forming in 1562.

Embryo Anabaptists also before, Art. v11. Sect. 111.

h Waterland, Athan. p. 197, and thereabouts.—Wall, Bapt.

4to. p. 203, on Pelagius's Creed.

the fixth Century; and before the year 1500, there had been thirteen Commentators upon it, which are known now.

The reception of this Creed in the Western Church, was favourable; it was there read and admired; but some have doubted whether it was ever in the Eastern Church. Not with the Filioque as we now have it, probably! In England, it got ground in the tenth Century; but it was never supported by any Council. Yet, in the middle ages, it was appealed to as authority.

Whoever wrote this Creed, he meant nothing more than to collect things faid in various catholic writers, against the various Herefies subsisting, and to simplify and arrange the expressions, so as to form a contession of faith the most concise, orderly, and comprehensive possible. Not with any view of explaining any mysterious truths, but with the sole design of rejecting hurtful or heretical errors.

Mr. Gibbon objects bitterly to this Creed as being spurious p; but the early Christians used some-

times

i Waterland, p. 88.

k Why then fo many Greek MSS?

<sup>1</sup> See a curious passage, p. 372, Octavo, 2d. Edit. of Travis's Letters to Gibbon; from Gibbon and Petavius.

m Middle ages continued from 475 to 1453, according to Harris. Philol p. 240.

n Opposite the title-page of D-5-6, Magd. Coll. Cambr. is the following MS. Note: in Bp. Gibson's hand, as I have reason to think.

<sup>&</sup>quot;A Swedish Minister affures me to day, that the Athanasian Creed is read constantly in the publick Service, on Rogation and Trinity Sundays, and that all children are obliged to get it by heart."

EDM. LONDON.

Whitehall, Jan. 21, 1730-1.

o "The famous Creed which so clearly expounds the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation," &c.—Gibbon's Hist. Vol. 3. p. 544, quarto.

P Gibbon as above, p. 544, this objection is adopted in Hints, &c.

times to ascribe to others their own works, without any bad intention in any had intention in the street and what is customary does not deceive:—And, moreover, this creed may have been adopted on account of its excellence, in bringing the errors, which were to be shunned, into a small compass, in exposing them in a kind of poetic numbers, which strike and possess the ear; and may have been called Athanasian, only on account of its containing Dostrines, which had been defended with peculiar force and brilliance, by the great Prelate of Alexandria.

IX. Let us now pass from the History of this Creed, to some Historical explanation of its several clauses. We will follow the order of the Creed itself.

Some condemning clauses come first; but, as the Creed concludes with one of them, we may confider them last.

The doctrinal part of the Creed may be divided into two parts; one relating to the doctrine of the Trinity; the other to that of the Incarnation of the Son of God. I wish the paragraphs had been numbered.

The

<sup>4</sup> Lardner's Works, Vol. 2. p. 310.—B. 1. Chap. x11. Sect. 1v. of this.

That it did contain his doctrines, see quotation from Dr. Burgh's Inquiry, &c. p. 384, Note; made in the answer to Hints, &c. called an Apology, &c. (supposed to bewritten by Bp. Hallifax) p. 48. Perhaps some of the old Titles of the Creed might bear such a construction as the following: The true faith, according to the opinions of Athanasius. If it was not called Athanasian till the end of the 7th Century, it could scarcely have been published as Athanasius's; in 430 at least;—and it does contain his Doctrines: No imposition therefore.

s Waterland observes, p. 273, that "Athanasius has left fome Creeds and confessions, undoubtedly his, which yet have never obtained the esteem and reputation that this hath done."

The first question which occurs is, have any Christians confounded the Persons of the Holy Trinity? the answer is, the Sabellians' did this. Have any divided the substance? All those who denied consubstantiality; that is, who were not homoüsians; all those who have denied the Divinity of the second and third persons; and those also may be added, who have held three original principles, tests and avages:—these would be Tritheists; but some would be called so, who only maintained three Persons in one Deity: therefore the Orthodox might have occasion to declare against such division of the divine nature, or substance.

I look upon all, down to "three Lords," to be in opposition to those, who divided the substance; the first sentence may seem an exception, but I think it is here only introductory to the rest.—The term "uncreate" would appear to relate to the Arians, who thought the Son a Creature, and the Holy Ghost a Creature of a Creature: as also indeed to others.—The word incomprehensible means here to express immensity, as appears from the Latin and Greek, and from some old English: that which is immense cannot be comprehended in any space,

bu

The heretical opinions referred to in this explanation, lie so in order, in the first and second Articles, and are so easily found by the Syllabus, or Heads of Lectures, that it seems needless to put down the pages where they are to be met with —1795. I have also given some short accounts of them in my printed Sermon on Mark xvi. 16.

<sup>&</sup>quot; See Bingham, 11. 3. 4.

<sup>&</sup>quot; For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost."—This sentence rather corresponds to what went before, "neither confounding the Persons;" and makes it easier to take the subject of dividing the substance first.

y Waterland p. 249. ακαταληπτος, απειεος, αμετεος, -im-mensus.

but we do not now commonly use the term incomprehensible to signify this.—The expressions "three eternals" and "one eternal," may seem out of the common way; but the thing to be expressed is, that each divine attribute is common to the three persons, though each has personal relative qualities,

peculiar to himself.

All the rest, which relates to the Holy Trinity, except a kind of recapitulation, is against those, who confounded the Persons; and sets forth the personal, relative, peculiar qualities now mentioned;—so that what has been already said, expresses the Union of the three divine persons; what remains to be said (of the Trinity) will express the distinctions between them. But there seems no occasion for any explanatory remark, unless we observe, that those, who neglected the distinction of Persons, might substitute one for another at will; which would make it indifferent to them whether they spoke of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or of three Fathers, or three Sons, or "three Holy Ghosts."

As the former part of the Creed rejects and excludes all prevailing errors with regard to the Trinity, so does the latter part with regard to the Incarnation of Christ. We will proceed as before, inquiring who the persons alluded to, are. then have denied, that Christ is God? Ebionites, Nazarens, Photinians, Arians; as appeared under the fecond Article.—Who, that he was Man? The fects of Docetæ, the Apollinarians, and the Euty-Who, that he was "God of the substance of his Father?" The Arians called Christ a God, but denied the rest. Who held, that Christ was not "begotten before the worlds?" all who denied his Divinity, except the Arians .- Who denied, that Christ was " Man of the substance of his Mother?" the Eutychians; not to mention the Anabaptists,

who arose fince the Creed was made. Who denied, that Christ had a reasonable soul? the Apollinarians; they maintained, that the Logos was to him in the place of a reasonable soul. By the way, the colon put after "perfect man," for chanting, may missead: it should rather be after "perfect God:" perfect man confifts of foul and body.-Who have spoken of Christ as of two agents? the Nestorians. -Who have conceived the Incarnation to be effected by means of a conversion or transubstantiation of the Deity into Flesh? And who, when such conversion took place, or was supposed to take place, imagined a confusion or consolidation of the natures divine and human?—Here perhaps Heretics have fpoken less plainly, than in other cases; but they have faid enough to require the attention and vigilance of the Catholics in rejecting their errors; which is all we are here concerned with. Arians conceived the Word to be made Flesh in fuch a fense, that he was susceptible of suffering 2. The Eutychians feem to have conceived, that the Word was fo united to Flesh, that the humanity was loft, or absorbed, annihilated, though the Body or Flesh evidently remained; which amounted to a conversion of the Godhead into Flesh; and they, conceiving the nature to be but one, accounted for the unity, by a melting down of the two natures together: - In the Creed of Pelagius, we find some mentioned, who held a double conversion of nature

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pearson on the Creed under "fuffered." p. 380, Quarto, p. 187, Folio.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Serm. de Tempore 191, aut 236, inter opera Augistini.— This Creed of Pelagius is also in *Jerom's* works: and in Wall on Baptism, Chap. 19. Sect. 29, 30.

b Illorum quoque similitur execramur Blasphemiam, qui novo sensu assere conantur, à tempore susceptæ carnis, omnia quæ erant Divinitatis in hominem demigrasse, et rursum quæ humani-

or substance at the same time, so that the divine nature became human, and the human divine: thus a confusion of substance was accomplished; and the Son, instead of being both God and Man, was neither. These persons are not called by any name, as a fect, but are faid to affert the incarnation in novo sensu.-The expression, " taking of the Manhood unto God," answers to one in the same Creed of Pelagius: "Verbum carnem esse factum, sed assumendo hominem, non permutando Deitatem;" and to one in the genuine works of Augustin; " à divinitate carne susceptâ;" and I do not suppose, that more is meant by taking the manhood into God, than by Christ's taking man's nature upon him. If a junction is to be expressed, it cannot be expressed more harmlessly, than by faying, the finite was assumed by the infinite, or taken into the infinite. We want to reject all notions inconfiftent with an union of the natures divine and human; or with their continuing distinct, though united.

"Unity of person," is opposed to Eutychian unity of Nature, as well as to the Nestorian duplicity of Person.

The Paraphrase or Commentary of Waterland on this Creed, which makes his tenth Chapter, is the best that I know of.

x. After the explanation, should come the *Proof*; but it is the nature of a Creed to collect propositions supposed to have been already proved.

tatis erant, in Deum transsusa: ut, quod nulla unquam hæresis ausa est dicere, videatur hac consusione utraque exinanita esse substantia, et Deitatis scilicet, et humanitatis; et amisso proprio statu, in aliud esse mutata: ut [nos] qui tam Deum persectum in Filio, quàm hominem consitemur, nec Deum verè nec hominem tenere credamur.

We have indeed, in the two former creeds, mentioned a clause or two, which had been left unproved, but we have no such clauses here.—There is only one thing, which wants proof here, that I am aware of, and that is, the propriety of the anathemas, or damnatory clauses.—But we will drop the word anathema, as that will be considered under

the eighteenth Article.

These damnatory clauses have occasioned much needless uneasiness. When such men, I say not as Chillingworth, for we have judged him weak in religious reasoning, but as Clarke, Tillotson c, Secker, could be uneafy under them, I can ascribe it to nothing but the influence of religious terror; a fentiment which operates in all possible degrees; which makes us fcruple to admit in religion, what would occasion no difficulty in common affairs, left our acquiescence should be owing to some corrupt or indirect motive. Indeed these great men, or fome of them, might possibly attend as much to prefumed scruples in others, as to any of their own They might judge, that, whatever they themfelves could do, it was not to be expected, that the generality of men would be induced to fet their minds at eafe.

Scruples of this kind are owing to not freely admitting those limitations, which common sense suggests in the application of every general proposition. Here I would recommend a careful perusal of the opening of Dr. Ogden's fifth Sermon on the Commandments; because it expresses well what I mean, and was written without the least view to our present subject. It also explains the expression, before all things it is necessary." I will only give

See Hints, &c. p. 32. and Answer p. 51.—Clarke perhaps, as favouring some degree of Arianism.

you a small part of it. "The Preacherd," says Dr. Ogden, "prohibits in the most comprehensive expressions, and under the severest penalties. For the making of necessary exceptions and limitations, we are left to our own reslections, to nature, to experience, and the common sense of all the world."

The damnatory clauses before us may be divided into two kinds. The first declaring the evil of rejecting Christianity, or the Catholic Faith, without specifying wherein that faith consists: the second declaring the evil of rejecting the particular doctrines of the Creed.—The two first sentences speak of the Christian doctrine in general, be it what it may; and the last fays the same thing;—that the Creed may end as it began. And that clause, which says, that we should believe rightly the Incarnation, mentions no particulars, and is therefore fuch, taken feparately, as any Christian might agree to.—But the others relate to the doctrines of the Creed.— "The right faith is this:"-" must thus think of the Trinity:" and "the right faith is,"—and then specifying what it is, with regard to the Incarnation.

First, let us take the threat, which concerns the right Faith in general, or genuine Christianity at large. Does this differ from Mark xvi. 16? "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be faved; but

d A proposer of a system of religion, may come under this idea of a preacher; it must have been the sense of our Lord, when he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every Creature," - Mark xvi. 15.

By the Catholic faith feems to be meant, genuine Christianity; unadulterated by fanciful notions, whims, refinements, &c.—the expression has come from such Christianity being held by what might be called the whole Church; reckoning a few fanciful Sects as exceptions not worthy of notice.

he that believeth not, shall be damned."-Suppose it does not, you fay, that does not clear up my difficulties. But it ought, confidering the Creed only as a Creed: for a Creed is perfect, if it agrees with Scripture. If you have any objections to the text of Scripture, those must not be objections to the Creed; in whatever the Scripture is blameable, the Creed is free from blame, supposing the Creed to quote Scripture, or fay what is equivalent to it.

But we will not be fo strict; we will consider this text a little, though commenting on Scripture is not now our immediate business.—Christ, having given all his proofs of the truth of his Religion, just before his ascension, commands his disciples to preach his Religion after his departure; and to those ministers, whom he commissions to preach, he fays, Converts shall be faved, but those, who refuse to be converted, shall be condemned. truth of this religion, which was to be preached, was all the while undoubted; taken for granted.

Therefore the meaning is, whoever accepts a message really sent from heaven, must gain some benefit from it; whoever rejects fuch message, must at least suffer the loss of that benefit; but he may moreover have positive punishment inflicted upon him, because of his rejecting what God gave him fufficient opportunity to accept. For it cannot be questioned, that God suits his evidence to our faculties, so that we may receive divine truth if we use them rightly. What more reasonable than

fuch a declaration?

Such is the case, when the Gospel is committed to Apostles or other authorized teachers, who believe it, to be by them proposed to Mankind; or when it is preached amongst those, who have no prejudice against it. But, if a preacher proposes Christianity to an infidel, threatening punishment on refusal, the measure may seem more doubtful; yet still the truth of what he proposes must be taken for granted, in order to make his threatening of any significance. And therefore, in that case, the meaning of the threat is, supposing my doctrine true, you will incur great evil by rejecting it. This is a very great incitement to examine diligently and honestly, but it cannot afford any argument to accept without examining. For, if the religion were false, it could not be accepted without excluding the true; and all threats of its

preachers must be vain.

It is strange, but, apparently, nothing more is wanted for easing all difficulties arising from such threatenings as we are speaking of, than the plainest and most felf-evident of all moral propositions; No man is punishable for rejecting falshood: Why then, you fay, does not the Creed express this? because it is fo plainly implied as to be needless; and because it would (according to Dr. Ogden's observation) weaken the effect, which a warning must be intended to produce.-Why, you urge, need a Creed make any warning or threat? A threat is not indeed effential to a Creed; but if those, for whom it is made, are negligent, light minded. contemptuous, interested, timid, prejudiced, capricious, or devoted to pleasure; or if they rely on being well-meaning, or commonly honest; or if they have any religious faults, fuch as fanaticism, &c. a threat may be very useful to rouse them, or to restrain them, to make them follow their best reason, and exert their best faculties. It is a folemn

1. A threat promotes examination, instead of preventing it.

f Perhaps the thoughts here offered, may appear better in the following order:

folemn thing to publish, amidst a crowd of heresies and religious extravagancies, a system of sound
doctrines: it must, in some cases, require all the
efforts of the most powerful teacher to make truth
ingenuously received. Yet it must always be needful to banish, as much as possible, all indifference
for facred truth. If it is indifferent to neglect
Truth, then Reason was given us in vain; then
error leads to no mischief; yet what are moral
errors, but opinions that are hurtful to mankind?—
If it be indifferent to reject Christianity, then
Christ died in vain s: and the Prophets in vain
foretold his coming, ever since the world began.

I suppose this might suffice to justify those threats of our Creed, which relate to rejecting pure Christianity, or the Catholic Faith at large, without specifying any particular doctrines: Yet it may be worth while to make one or two additional remarks.

1. Being saved and being damned, or condemned, do not imply any one fixed degree of happiness or misery; but admit of various degrees, without

2. It is made needful by the many faults, which may hinder a man from allowing the infinite Importance of Religious Truth.

3. Wherein the Importance of religious truth confifts: from the nature of the thing, and from the positive declarations of Scripture.

The necessity of a right Belief, or of endeavouring to attain one, might be more fully shewn, if it were made a separate subject.—See Dr. Balguy Ser. 9. p. 158—160. What he says in one part answers exactly to my idea of our damnatory clauses when rightly taken; though he probably was not thinking of them. "Let those, who think it a matter of small importance, whether the Religion of Jesus be true or false, attend well to the force of these expressions, (of Scripture) and tremble at the consequences of their own neglect."

Whatever should be offered, in treating this subject of the necessity of acquiring a right belief, or right notions, as far as, humanly speaking, we are able, would be so much in favour of the damnatory clauses in question.

without limit. Both in Heaven and Hell, there may be many mansions. Nor is any great degree necessarily implied in the word "everlasting," taken singly. Indeed every fine, however small, is an everlasting punishment. Yet we may easily suppose too small a degree of evil, as well as too large an one, to be implied in the word "damned."

The endless number of degrees of happiness and misery, which may be comprized under the terms falvation and condemnation, might ferve to compose some disputes about the salvation of Heathers, and of those, who lived before the time of Christ-—These persons may possibly enjoy lower degrees of happiness than good Christians, and yet may be faved; or may fuffer mifery in a lower degree than wicked Christians, and yet be condemned.—It does not appear to me a Christian doctrine, that any person will be happy in the same degree with a good Christian; whether his want of Christian Faith was his fault, or only his misfortune. Every man may mils happinels by misfortune; by bad parents, by being amongst savages, &c. &c.—under a bad civil Government, &c. &c.—indeed this is the very meaning of the word misfortune.

2. Mark xvi. 16. must be so understood, as to be consistent with the texts about judging; Matt. vii. 1.—Rom. xiv. 4.—James iv. 12. Therefore no man, not even a commissioned teacher, has a right to apply Mar. xvi. 16. to any particular case. Not even to his own case. That is, he is not, by the general denunciation, to imagine, that he can see how any particular man will be finally rewarded

or punished.

3. And, as Man is not a judge, and as God is the only judge in all particular cases, no extraordinary situation ought to occasion any uneasiness. It is not to be supposed, that a Judge all-wise and

all-powerful will proceed mechanically: his remiftion of punishment, as well as his adjusting of rewards, may fully be believed capable of suiting all situations, however nice and complicated.

As therefore a person, who believes and is baptized, may not in effect be saved, if he neglect the conditions stipulated in baptism; so it may possibly happen, that a man may disbelieve and reject the truth itself, and yet not be condemned to any great positive evil, if God knows that his disbelief is owing to some extraordinary want of the means of information. Hence no one should be unhappy about any extraordinary case, of himself or his friends: the true of Heart should be glad.

4. Denunciation of vengeance against vice is made in general terms, as in Rom. i. 18.—ii. 6, &c. yet it is not imagined, that repentance will be unavailing, or that much will be required of him, to whom little has been given. It would be difficult to shew why threatenings against infidelity

should be more strictly interpreted.

These additional remarks are often wanted, on a subject which is apt to occasion uneasiness: if they are abused, the guilt must fall on those who abuse them.

Let us now consider those condemning clauses of our Creed, which threaten all who reject its particular dostrines. Here Mark xvi. 16. will assume this form:— 'He that believeth the orthodox dostrines of this creed, (having been already baptized) will be saved; but he that believeth them not, will be damned.' When this form is addressed to such as have no particular objections to those dostrines, but only think a good fort of man need not trouble himself about such matters, I suppose there is not much difficulty: the threats are then plainly seen to be, what in truth they always

are, warnings and incitements to a fair and diligent

study of religious truth.

But, if an orthodox preacher proposes his system to a Diffenter or Heretic, then the case, though it may feem more difficult, is the same as when an Apostle proposes Christianity to an Heathen: to make his threats of any consequence, his doctrine must be supposed to be true. The orthodox teacher fays, in effect, supposing my doctrines to be really those of Christianity, or of the true catholic faith, you will fuffer by rejecting them; to reject them, is to reject the catholic faith itself. This is, as before, an incitement to attention, because still, if the person adopts what is false, he cannot be at liberty to adopt what is true; - and therefore the threat, in reality, operates against accepting implicitly.

If, as before, you ask, why does the author of the Creed fay positively, "the catholic faith is this," and not speak on supposition of truth? the answer is the same: it must be implied; and it would be unnatural, and unfuitable to the purpose of his folemn exordium, which is of the nature of an eloquent exhortation, to introduce doubts and hesitations, when he wanted to rouse an earnest attention to what he affured himself was truth: common fense, when you thought calmly, would eafily supply you with the Jupposition or limitation, in case you found yourself unable to think that true,

which

h So it seems to me; our Divines in 1689 settled, that the condemning clauses should "be understood as relating only to those, who obstinately deny the substance of the Christian Faith." -A man cannot be condemned for rejecting the substance of the Christian Faith, but on supposition of the Truth of Christianity, And a man may fuffer for rejecting the Doctrine of the Church of England, on supposition of the truth of that Doctrine: - and the same is true of the tenets of any set of Diffenters from the Church of England.

which he imagined to be indisputably true. It will bear repeating, No man is punishable for rejecting falshood: and every man sees this, when he

thinks coolly; and is ready to act upon it.

If you ask again, why need the Author of the Creed prefix a threat to his system of doctrines? the answer may be repeated; because he thought the errors of great importance, which his Creed was intended to exclude; because he thought every effort wanted to animate men's zeal in the cause.—

You will do well to prefix a solemn warning to whatever you publish as true and highly im-

portant.

One difference may be urged as subsisting between the two cases. Some men may say, (if they receive Christianity, but not what is called Orthodoxy) how unreasonable is it to alarm men with the denunciation of vengeance, in case they do not receive and profess doctrines, which are unintelligible!—it may not be amiss to take some notice of this difficulty, though we before had a chapter on affenting to unintelligible propositions\*.—In that chapter it was observed, that a proposition may be intelligible as rejecting an error, which is not so in itself. We can sometimes see, that a thing is wrong.

Our Reformatio Legum has a short chapter on this subject: De summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, cap. 17.

k Book III. Chap. x.

I am told, that the Baptists at a certain Town, at a folemn ordination, declared in their fermons repeatedly, that no one can be faved, who is only baptized as an infant, or, who does this or that, contrary to their peculiar notions.—I hope they meant as is here settled.—Mark xvi. 16. would assume this form; He that believeth our doctrine, and is baptized, as an adult, shall be saved; but he that is baptized as an infant, or believeth not our doctrines, shall be damned.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The negative form of some propositions in the Creed of Pelagius, or the Ser. de Tempore 191 (236) are worthy of commendation; as has before been observed.

wrong, when we have not a distinct idea how to alter it, so as to make it right. I look upon the propositions of the Athanasian Creed as rejecting errors, even when they are not in a negative Nay, it might bear an inquiry, whether even the unintelligible propositions contained in the Aticles, ought not, in strictness, to be confidered in that light. But, if this is true only with regard to the Creed, the propositions of it may be all intelligible, if rightly taken. this be true in part, they may be intelligible in part -Some propositions in the Creed are unintelligible to some persons, because they know not the opinions rejected; as was observed in the chapter above-mentioned.—But these are only on the footing of other unintelligible propositions, to which a man may have occasion to give a verbal affent, for the good of Religious Society. (Book 111. Chap. x.) -For whatever reasons any propositions are unintelligible, it should always be remembered by those, who are to affent to them, that, when we have no opinion, we can have no feeling of certainty, or clear conviction: our mind is unfixed; our affent fluctuating. The want of fuch fixed feeling has fometimes occasioned uneafiness and scruples; and fo has excited prejudices against confessions of Faith.

We may here also make the same additional re-

marks, as in the former cafe.

1. The word "perish" admits of degrees, as well as "faved" and "damned:" it is probably used either as equivalent to "damned," or as being somewhat less harsh.

2. An orthodox preacher has no more right to pass final judgement on an heretic or dissenter, than a preacher of Christianity at large on an insidel.—

Nor has an orthodox preacher any right to apply the

threat of St. Mark to any particular case; not even to his own.—That is, though any man may say, I must be careful how I reject truth, because if I do, I shall suffer; though any minister has authority to say, You must be very careful how you reject truth; yet no man ought to make himself unhappy, as if he must of course be damned for disbelieving the tenets of a certain Creed; no Minister has a right to say, you will be damned, if you do not account my doctrines essential to the true Christian Faith.

3. The Deity may exercise his power of remitting, on the Heretic, as well as on the Infidel; according to the circumstances of education, &c.—perhaps such power of remitting may be exercised in a greater degree on rejecting a right mode of Christianity, than on rejecting the substance.

4. The denunciations against heresy ought not to be interpreted more strictly than those against infidelity; perhaps somewhat less strictly:—certainly therefore not more strictly than denunciations

against Vice.

I hope I may now conclude, that a mind not tinctured with superstition, or religious fear, will be able to supply such rational limitations to the general threatenings of our Creed, as to judge them harmless in all situations, and useful in many; that their tendency is, when terror does not discompose the judgement, to make men "prove all things," and not to accept even the doctrines of the Creed itself implicitly, lest, in accepting anything erroneous, they should eventually reject the truth.

xII. But,

m Would not this be the right idea for any one to have when he faid Amen to the curses or Anathemas in Deut. xxvii, introduced in our Commination?

pulous in supplying limitations, I will put an end to my remarks on these damnatory clauses by an attempt to supply such limitation myself, in a kind of *Paraphrase* on the opening of the Creed; and, as they make the most difficult part of our present Article, which does not come into some other Article, we may suppose the *Application* to begin here; and with a kind of form of Assert.

'Herefies are very numerous; defiling the purity of the Faith, making men act on wrong principles, affording handle to infidelity, and dividing Christians amongst themselves, so as to defeat the ends of religious Society, and probably lofe fome degree of future happiness; it seems needful therefore to draw the erroneous notions, which are fo pernicious, into a finall compass, and folemnly reject them; that the unwary may be cautioned, and the bold and bufy innovator discouraged .-And, left the unstable, who are toffed about with every wind of Doctrine, should continue to indulge their childish fondness for Novelty, and live on without any regular and permanent principles, it feems also needful to remind them of the last folemn declaration of our bleffed "Lord: not furely with a view to bias the judgement, but only to inforce the duty of a fober and ferious attention to facred Truth, uninfluenced by passion or caprice; to fuggest, that what Christ died to accomplish, cannot be an indifferent matter. He, who is impreffed with this thought, will of course describe particulars according to his own judgement; but he will do that without denying, that all other men, duly qualified and authorized, may do the fame.'

Mark xvi. 16.

fame.' Such an act of affenting, no one, I should

hope, would deem unreasonable.

Mutual concessions seem to have little place in the present Article: such as relate to the Doctrines, have been proposed (or will be) under the several Articles, in which those doctrines are respectively laid down. -- And concessions with regard to damnatory clauses seem to be rendered unnecessary, by the liberty of using them being equally allowed to all. -As also by our declaration, that they are not effential to a Creed.—At least, if the explanations of them here given are not fufficient to prevent disputes, I know of nothing which would answer that purpose.

We may consider therefore whether anything in the way of Improvement occurs on looking back on

this Article.

And the first question which is suggested by such a review is, whether on the whole it would be an improvement, if the Creed, of which we are treating, were to be expunged from our Liturgy. America, it is excluded; and feveral eminent o men in our own church, from whose works the members of it receive continually instruction and improvement, have feemed to wish it removed. Dr. Waterland, on the other hand, who feems to have attended to it most fairly, is for retaining it. the commission of 1689, it was to be retained. Bishop Gibson, whom I consider as very eminent for extensive knowledge, under the guidance of found reason and plain unadulterated common fense, appears to have been a friend to the retaining of it.

Some

See Hints, &c. p. 32, and Answer p. 47.

P See Waterland's Pref. Nov. 7, 1727: and Apology, in answer to Hints, &c. p. 46.

Some have had an idea of throwing out the condemning clauses, and retaining the Doctrines: which is not an impractible plan, if desirable on the whole 1.—But let us take them separately.

With regard to the Doctrines, one does not fee why they may not be retained as long as our Thirtynine Articles are retained, which coincide in doctrine with the Creed'. The doctrinal part of the creed has been called a Bulwark'; and if it be maintained, it should be maintained as a fortification. In time of peace, the inconvenience of keeping up fortifications occasions their being sometimes neglected, but when war breaks out afresh, every one is clamorous in blaming the imprudence of fuch neglect; if we are at peace now with the powers, which would attack us where our Creed would be our defence, we are always liable to be at war with them again. We have feen how naturally all the Herefies condemned in the Creed arife, when men once become eager in folving the difficulties of the Trinity and the Incarnation: and fuch eagerness might at any time arise, on any revolution, or great disturbance, or confusion. The Eutychian notions.

This plan was recommended in a feparate paper, or very small pamphlet, printed at Ipswich, in 1794; which the British Critic approves. I am very much obliged to the Author for the handsome things, which he says of me.—Some time after the publication, and after I had spoken thus, my friend, Mr. Pearson, of Sidney college, Cambridge, owned himself to be the Author; a Gentleman, to whom our Country is obliged for the best set of Sermons on the State Fast and Festivals (as far as my judgement goes) that I ever read. Bp. Butler's I have not read lately; and they are only on two out of the four.

The Candid disquisitors are for retaining the Creed, but never having it publicly read; in the same manner as we retain the 39 Articles.—p. 96. 2d Edit.

Waterland, p. 274, from Luther.

Under the Second Article.

notions, which make the most difficult part of our · Creed, were revived at the Reformation"; and the Maid of Kent suffered death at the stake rather than relinquish them, after a twelvemonth's reflexion in confinement. And in case of renewed attacks, our present Creed would be a much better defence than any new one that would be made at the time it was wanted. In the candid disquisitions, too much difference is made, in my opinion, between literate and illiterate people: an illiterate man understands the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, as well as the literate: there is no part of Learning, which is of any fignificance to the Creed, but an acquaintance with the opinions of some Christian Heretics, and that lies in a very fmall compais\*.

But we are now in actual war about many doctrines rejected by our Creed. And I suspect, that many of those, who are so impatient about it, fecretly favour a change in the Doctrines of the Church; and are, at bottom, adverse to the Creed

because it is so impregnable.

With regard to retaining the condemning clauses, they feem so little difficult to me, that I am scarce a judge what should be done. Some alterations they might admit; but I think the explanation now given, both of them and the Doctrines, fuch

as,

\* See Free and Candid Disquisitions, beginning of Chap. 6. -

Alfo p. 280, 2d Edit.

Whiston revived the Apollinarian Heresy.

y 1795. It has fometimes occurred to me, that the explanations of the condemning clauses here given, go more upon the idea of teaching others, than of confessing one's own belief. Yet Mark xvi. 16. is a general Declaration, applicable to all particular occasions: a man may use it in settling his own principles, and in listening to instruction, as well as in instructing others. Besides, in the more particular and fuller creeds, one who repeats them is really in controversy: he is professing in

as, by proper language, might be made intelligible even to the people.

The Creed taken all together has been admired; I can conceive it; I believe it is now admired by many, who have not given themselves to speculations and scruples about it. Doubt and perplexity damp the warmth of any sentiment; but, if these were settled by some authoritative and received limitations, &c. I should expect it to be admired generally by those, who resigned their minds to its doctrines. If it really be admired and esteemed, though only by a part of our Congregations, that is some reason for retaining it. Christians, when they can, should be indulgent to wishes of their Brethren.

What shall we say then? Let the Creed be retained, read seldom, and explained (according to what has been said of explaining things unintelligible) to the people. The Swedish custom introduces it too seldom, only twice in the year: ours perhaps rather too often, thirteen times; it is a matter, which need not be settled to a great nicety.

But before I quit the subject of improvements, I will submit to the judgment of the candid, when

what he differs from his Brethren. He is making a tacit contrast between himself and others; and is, in effect, proposing to them to join his Society.

I was once warmly reproved by a fensible and respectable Parish Clerk for not reading it on both the two successive Sundays, Whit-sunday and Trinity-sunday.—The parish a small one in the Country.

2 Book 111. Chap. 111. Sect. 1v.

The Commission of 1689 had agreed, that it should be read fix times a year, instead of thirteen. See Possscript to Waterland's Preface, (to his Hist. Athan. Creed) dated Nov. 7, 1727.—A note of Waterland, p. 244, beginning of 10th Chapter, says, that it was, at one time, 1555, read daily in the Church.

ther every Sect should not produce a Creed, in order to entitle it to Toleration? and (leaving the two shorter Creeds, as being established) whether fomething thrown into the Athanasian Creed, about the nature of unintelligible Doctrines, and of verbal arguments made out of them, might not give fatisfaction to many minds?—and laftly, left the damnatory clauses should still occasion difficulty, whether it would not be better to have the threats in words of Scripture, than in words of human composition? whether if Mark xvi. 16, was pronounced, or fung, at the opening and conclusion, instead of the present application of it, and also between the rehearfal of the Doctrine of the Trinity and that of the Incarnation, in the manner of the Gloria Patri; and inftead of "the Catholic faith is this," fome other expression was used, such as "the faith we hold is this;" the Creed would not be more generally fatisfactory, and its folemnity be at least equally great?—If Mark xvi. 16. appeared, after all, too striking and alarming, perhaps that expression so often repeated in Scripture, might fometimes supply its place; "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear;" but I must confess, that, if these passages of Scripture were introduced, I should give my suffrage for the continuance of the Creed, in all its parts. And I do not decline affenting to it in its present Formd.

Dr. Wall fays, he fears that the Baptists have no fixed Baptismal Creed. See Hist. of Inf. Baptism, p. 509, Quarto.

d 1796.—In the year 1790, I feemed to have a kind of call upon me to lay before a respectable audience, at a Visitation, some thoughts on the Athanasian Creed; those, which the Reader has now gone through, being in my mind, I of course took such as seemed to suit the purpose: I was desired to print, I complied; saying, in an advertisement presixed to the Sermon, that I had delivered the same things more at length, in Lectures. This small publication was thought worth a pamphlet in answer,

called " a Review," &c. but that Review contained fo many things contrary to my ideas of Controversy, ideas expressed in the Second Book of this System, that I forbore replying to it.-I felt, indeed, a natural propensity to set several things right, both relating to myself personally, and to the reasonings which I had used; but I have had the happiness to find, that those whose opinions I valued most, have done what I had wished to do, for themselves. - In my Lectures since the Review came out, I have declared to my hearers, that I had repeatedly perused it, in hopes of deriving improvement from it, but that I really had no new knowledge to communicate.—I hope I shall always peruse with attention, and with a real defire of correcting my errors, whatever may be written in opposition to any work of mine: and as the present work contains many controverted opinions, this may be a proper occasion to say, that if any perfons, adversaries or friends, should ever make me see any subject in a new light, I shall be defirous to make my new opinion as public as the old one; and therefore if I retract nothing, it may be concluded, that I think I have nothing material to retract.—As to defending, it is often, as was just now hinted, labour thrown away. Readers in general, or at least the more estimable fort, are able to see through Sophistry themselves, and to despise personal abuse. And I might now claim some exemptions on account of age, and of other works which want a finishing hand. Nevertheless, if any candid person, kindly disposed, will openly, under his own name, take the trouble to inform me, that, after a fair and attentive confideration, he cannot get over any particular objection, either to my conduct or my reasoning, it will be my wish, at least, to give such a person satisfaction.



### 120 BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. 1.

The Articles of the Church of England may be considered as consisting of three Parts. The first ends, and the second begins, here. The third begins with the eighteenth Article. That part which we have gone through, relates to what we are to study, in order rightly to obey God and his Word. That which we now enter upon, regards the nature of man, and human obedience; taking man as an individual. The last part relates to the same, taking him as a member of a Christian Church. As our Articles were composed chiefly with a view to separating from the Church of Rome, the doctrines of that Church are treated with peculiar attention.

#### INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND PART.

THE second part, which is now our immediate object, seems more easy to comprehend in one's own mind, than to explain to others; the doctrines it contains, if only thought of, may seem consonant to common sense, but, if delivered in words, may seem nice and abstruste.—

These doctrines are connected together; and have all a tendency to determine how far the agency of God or the agency of Man should be conceived as effecting the salvation of Christians.

The many disputes and perplexities, which have arisen concerning this class of Doctrines, have been so much owing to the want of considering the nature

Those, who savour the agency of man, speak, in their most formal discussions, the language of ordinary Life: those, who savour the agency of God, speak frequently the language of ordinary Life; but, on more folemn occasions, introduce a mode of language, which makes man no agent at all, merely passive.

BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. 11. 121

nature of human LANGUAGE, that it would be worth while to lay down a few preliminary remarks on that subject, before we come to be biassed by our prejudices about any particular tenets.

And we shall do this with the greater clearness and effect, if we consider language, as relating to human actions, in the first place, independently of

scriptural expressions.

We must not expect, by this method, to gain any thing that can be called a complete knowledge of the human mind; or of those principles of action, on which virtue and its rewards depend: it must be thought sufficient if we learn where to submit to the ignorance belonging to our present state, so as to avoid dispute and perplexity; which are generally owing to our speaking as if we understood that, which our Maker has placed beyond our comprehension.

Some men are greatly prejudiced against II. this fort of discussion. Not so much on reflexion, as before reflexion: they throw it aside in disgust; it is trifling, quibbling, perplexing; too difficult to do good, or perhaps too obvious to require any thought or care. And after reflexion, it is sometimes condemned as having led men into great intricacies, and produced much false science.-There may be some truth in the facts; and it is really mortifying to find, that we know fo little as we do about our own actions; but I consider the evil as having arisen from abuse rather than from the Nature of the thing: and I am perfuaded, that great care to admit only what we really do fee and feel, and that only just as we see and feel it, is a much better plan, than running away from discussion, or shutting our eyes whenever we cannot fee distinctly.

111. If popular language is understood too strictly, it will always mislead. It is taken from our feelings, made for use, and suited to circumstances; a proposition expressed universally is by no means to be taken as liable to no limitations. A person indeed in the proper circumstances makes the due limitations eafily, scarce conscious of what he does; -but one not in the proper circumstances, or not able to conceive himself in them, always gets wrong.—This is true both of language about Bodies and language about Spirits: But yet we are less deceived by the former than the latter: especially fince the improvements made by Mr. Locke. A man conversant in philosophy, when he hears of fire being hot, gold being yellow and malleable, does not understand the expressions as if he had a knowledge of Bodies independent of their effects, though that is what the words feem to imply; but is aware, that nothing is meant but to describe the refult of past experience. I fear, that, when any one speaks of the foreknowledge of God, or the Will of Man, the expressions do not get so rationally reduced to what they really mean.—To prevent men from taking popular language concerning the mind, of God or Man, as if it were strictly philosophical and universal, is the intent of what I am going to offer.

IV. First, then, the language, which we make use of to express the acts of the mind, is not taken from any Theory, perfectly understood, but it is merely such as arises from our feelings, and such as is wanted for the active purposes of Life. It sounds as if it were more speculative and theoretical, but, if we take it as such, it will mislead us:—when we have

b See Book 1. Chap. x. Sect. 1. & v.

<sup>\*</sup> See the last Section of Article 111.

have faid a thing first with a particular view, we are very apt to make our observation general, and then it appears like mere theory; but, in reality, words are only invented and used originally, when expressing our feelings has some tendency to procure good .- To compare the language of men with that of Brutes, might perhaps be invidious; elfe I would wish any one to consider, whether the difference is not more in degree than in kind? When "the Lions to roaring after their prey, do feek their meat from God;" When the Horse " faith among the Trumpets', ha, ha," they are not suspected of making abstract propositions; they are only deemed to express that, which they really do express, their feelings, with a view to good. If men were more commonly supposed to do the fame thing, human language would be better understood. Or, were mens expressions to be construed more with a view to particular facts than it is, less error and dispute would arise.

v. A man fays, "I am my own mafter; I am certain I can do what I chuse:"—he expresses what he feels, and there is no deceit. Of the same man, another says, "hold a pistol to his breast, and tell him, you will shoot him if he does not give you a shilling; I am certain he must give it you;"—this man expresses the result of experience, and again there is no deceit. Yet put these into abstract propositions, and then the first is, 'Man is free;' the second, 'Man is under necessity.' And all the disputes about freedom and necessity arise from no other cause, than the seeming interference between these two propositions. I say seeming, because, though they interfere when delivered abstractedly, they do not interfere at all in their primitive form.—One man, who is the agent, expresses an inward

d Pfalm civ. 21.

e Job xxxix. 25.

## 124 BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. VI. VII.

feeling; the other, who is the spectator, expresses a result of experience.—These two cannot interfere, for they have no connexion with one another; any more than if one had said, 'I have the Gout in my foot,' and the other had said, 'the Sun will rise tomorrow morning;' how strange it would seem to argue from the admission of one of these events to the exclusion of the other!

vi. Men are often missed by language about the mind, because they take it for proper language, whereas it is always metaphorical.—We express the acts of the mind by a comparison with bodily actions. To reflect, is originally to bend back; to instill, or inculcate, is to drop in, or tread in: and fo on. Melancholy is black bile; dejection casting down, &c. Now, what we know by comparison only, we must know much less distinctly than what we see immediately, and have a plain and proper name for: and the less distinctly we fee anything, the less distinctly can we reason about it .- And, if we affix ideas to metaphorical terms, as if they were plain and proper, we are continually filling the mind with wrong ideas; which must, in time, produce erroneous propositions and conclusions.

vii. Language about human voluntary actions is imperfect in other respects: in using positive terms in negative senses. Spirit is a word, which is used as if we had a positive idea affixed to it; yet the safest way is to consider it as a mere negation of matter: and so the Soul, as a negation of the Body. But this observation is most wanted for the terms which imply infinity: for, though infinite is evidently in its etymology a negative term, yet omniscient, omnipresent, immense, omnipotent, &c. are apt to occur to the mind as having a positive signification: and

f This has been mentioned in Book 11. Chap. 111. Sect. 1v. but it is particularly wanted here.

## BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. VIII. 125

Mr. Locke fays, "there be those who imagine they have positive ideas of infinite duration and space."— This greatly affects our reasoning; for, if men go on connecting these terms in arguments, they get into errors, which they would have avoided if they had constantly kept in mind what kind of ideas are really annexed to them. - Such terms, indeed, of positive sound and negative meaning, do occur in common life; Health means often only a negation of diseases; those particularly, to which the person in question, is subject; - sweet often means only, not putrid; -and it may be the least be evil to use fuch terms in fuch fenses; but this does not remove our danger; in matters of a metaphyfical fort, we cannot be too cautious about admitting false conceptions.

viii. The imperfections of language in affigning causes should also be clearly seen. Assigning causes is a thing, which is so very frequently to be done, that it is done quickly, and familiarly;—inconsiderately, one might say; in words not weighed or attended to: those to whom it is done, are left to supply, from the nature of the thing, what is

deficient in the expression.

Sometimes a partial cause is assigned as if it were the whole;—this happens when there is some particular end in view, of recommending or depreciating. The Romans were freed from Kingly Government, and enjoyed liberty under Consuls. To whom was their Liberty owing? to Brutus, says an orator complimenting his family: To Lucretia, says another,

either

When I speak of impersection in language, I only mean, that it is impersect if taken strictly. The present manner of speaking may possibly be as convenient as any; and it is that, into which men naturally fall; only we must take care it does not deceive and missead us.

either speaking in favour of her act of Suicide, or proving, that Providence brings good out of evil.—Here, for Theory, that which is omitted should be fupplied; as in assigning good principles as a cause of anything, good actions are implied; and in assigning good actions as a cause, good principles. What is the cause of that man's preferment? his good conduct: this cannot be a complete account, except his good principles are supposed to be implied.—What is the cause why you are so attached to that man? because I believe him to be a man of thorough good principles. This is a partial account, in some sense, except good conduct be supposed to be implied.

Sometimes an effect is ascribed to a cause, which is merely verbal.—What is the cause of the Moon's being retained in an orbit? Gravity, Attraction:—but you know nothing of Gravity or Attraction, except those very effects which you ascribe to them.—In this way, events are ascribed to Nature, or to Fate; and, we might perhaps add, to

Merit.

Errors frequently arise from our speaking of un-known causes, as if they were known before their effects: and from our losing sight of those effects, from which all the little idea we have of the causes is derived. Whether we know the Being of a God à priori, has been doubted: but it seems, that we more commonly form our particular ideas of him à posteriori, from what we know of Man: we enlarge and purify human qualities to the greatest degree possible, and thence form our conceptions of the character of God. This is the best we can do; but sometimes we are not confistent;

Book 1. Chap. 111. Sect. 111.

Book 1. Chap. 111. Sect. 1.

BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. IX. 127

fistent; we ascribe qualities to God, of which we have had no experience, though perhaps under old names: I should not wonder if the disputes about the Divine *Prescience* were found to have had this origin.

I do not mean ascribing human actions, bodily members, &c. to God, but things too remote from humanity. When we speak of God's using any human means, or powers, as arm, eye, &c. we only intend to affert, that God'accomplishes some end, which, if it was performed by man, would be per-

formed by the intervention of fuch means.

We are apt to fay, Nature intended that such a thing should be so or so; our being right or wrong in this, seems to depend upon the distinction before us; if we gather the intention of Nature from experience of what is best, we are safe; if from a notion that we know something of Nature as a Person, before any experience, the intentions of Nature will prove to be nothing better than our own crude fancies.

1x. We have already hinted, that propositions seemingly universal, are in reality calculated for some particular situation of things; so that the circumstances, in which any proposition is used, make a part of its sense; and you cannot change those circumstances, without changing the sense. But this should now be mentioned again, for the sake of some illustrations belonging particularly to our present subject. There are several propositions used in morals and religion, which are in strictness only declamatory expressions, used for the purpose

m Sect. 111.-alfo Book 1. Chap. x. Sect. 1.

We have contended, B. I. Ch. IV. Sect. IV. for reasoning from effect to cause, and then back from cause to effect, in some cases; advantage is not taken of that here, because Nature seems nothing real; a mere name.

purpose of persuasion: or, as Mr. Harris calls" lamentations on the comparative wickedness of the present age, " natural declamations incidental to Man."-The affigning of partial causes, beforementioned, comes fometimes very near these eloquent enunciations.—But sometimes propositions in general terms have more the appearance of speculation than fuch descriptions, though they are made for a particular fituation or conception of "A state of Nature is a state of war;"suppose the state of Nature mentioned to be a state of undisciplined passions, and the affertion may be true: suppose the state that, in which every principle of human action has the strength and influence intended it by Nature, and the affertion is false. The former state comes nearer fast, the latter nearer ideal perfection; so we may fay, the affertion is true in practice, though false in Theory.

Hence, if due regard be not paid to circumstances, propositions will seem to contradict each other, when they really do not: or, they will be contradictory in words, though not in meaning. The Gravity of a Body, fays one, is greater as the fize of the body towards which it is attracted, and moves, is greater. No, fays another, the gravity of a body must be greater as its own size is greater; the larger a body is, the more it will weigh: no, fays a third, the gravity of a body is greater the nearer it is to the center of attraction. These are all right, and only feem to contradict each other through want of attention to circumstances.— However, it has been thought worth while to mark the different fituations here to be conceived, by giving gravity different names when spoken of in those different situations. In morals, this is not BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. XI. 129

done; therefore we should use the more caution, to answer the same end. The Will of Man is sometimes understood as equivalent to his wish, or desire; sometimes to his determination; so that, when a man determines to do anything disagreeable, or contrary to his desire, his will is contrary to his will.—And sometimes a man permits another to sollow his own choice; who may, by acting in consequence of the will of his superior, do something against his will. Nothing can be more intelligible than all this, (if the jingle of the words does not give some alarm) and yet, when things are said about the will of God, or man, without due attention to these circumstances, dispute and consusion are apt to arise.

Religion, natural and revealed, is *Predestination*.—
I believe, that most of the difficulties attending it are owing to want of attention to the elements now

laid down.

All our observations are useful on this subject: about words being taken from facts, being intended to answer some good purpose, and being metaphorical; about negative senses; affigning causes, partial and verbal: and confining general affirmations to particular circumstances; including declamatory expressions; for I am persuaded, that no faying about Predestination is any thing more than a declamatory expression, calculated to persuade, or excite good fentiments or emotions. - But to enter farther into this at present, would carry us into too great length for an Introduction. fore I pass on to expressions of Scripture; only hinting, that elements are feldom perfectly clear at first mention: that their justness must not, in general, be expected to appear fully, till they come to be applied to those particular cases, for which VOL. 111.

130 BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. XII.

they were intended, and from which, indeed, they were collected.

kind of expressions occur in Scripture, which have been now examined. Scripture-language is popular language; and must be so, however impersect that language be; otherwise it would have misled all

those, to whom it was addressed.

As to words coming from facts, external and internal, it will fuffice to fay, that numberless instances may be found, in which an agent speaks of himself as free, and in which a Spectator speaks of an agent subject to necessity. We might allege fuch instances as Matt. xviii. 7.—Luke xvii. 1. which give merely the refult of experience.—Scriptural terms relating to the mind must be metaphorical; there are no others:-Positive terms with negative meanings are common in scripture; as Spirit, Almighty, All-wise, &c .- Partial causes are affigned, as in the case of Faith and works; and one of these is implied in the other. And I believe Predestination may be, sometimes at least, confidered as a verbal or unknown cause of known effects: and much the same might be said of desert, or deferving. Descriptions of God taken from the qualities of men, and even from their bodily members, are more numerous in Scripture than in any other Book.

From general expressions supposed to be used within certain situations, arise all the seeming contradictions of Scripture. I have already mentioned declamatory expressions, and I might add instances of such lamentations as Mr. Harris was speaking of in the passage beforementioned: "there is none that doeth good, no not one," &c... the seeming inconsistencies about Temptations being desirable, or the contrary, and about the Will of God, are all

BOOK IV. INTROD. TO PART II. SECT. XV. 131

to be referred to this head: and indeed every other

feeming inconfiftency whatfoever°.

xIII. But, besides these difficulties, common to the scriptures and other popular writings, we seem to have some in addition, when we study the sacred Volume.

Our judgements are apt to be discomposed, by a warmth of veneration sometimes running perhaps into superstition: or by admiration and devotion: or by fear of deceiving ourselves; or, sometimes possibly, by a fear of being obliged in conscience to give up the party, to which we have been attached; or by suspicions, that we are not so ready to give it up as we ought to be: such feelings hinder us from judging calmly; they prevent our common sense from doing its proper office.

God, makes us scrupulous of treating it so freely as we would the word of man; and therefore we decline making those limitations, which are necessary to give us the true meaning. And though it must be a weakness to omit any thing, which we know is calculated to bring to light the truth, yet scruples do in effect produce the evil here

described.

xv. As the Scripture is a Revelation of the will of God, we are apt to expect, that every part will open to us some new truths; and therefore, that we must not use our reason and rules of interpreting here as in common cases... New facts may produce some new reasonings; but in general it appears, as we improve in the knowledge of the Scriptures, that the sacred writers took the knowledge of our duties for granted read, if we take

<sup>·</sup> Book 1. Chap. x. Sect. x. Note Vol. 1. p. 73.

P Dr. Balguy, p. 196.—See also p. 87, about Politics.

a scriptural remark on a known virtue for a publication of a new one, we must run into error.—
The scriptures have no doubt improved morality, by occasional remarks and reproofs, and by proposing new motives, &c. in short by methods which cannot now be particularly enlarged upon; but nothing is delivered, which need be exempted from the ordinary rules of rational interpretation and criticism.

Another thing, which has occasioned difficulties in understanding the Scriptures, is the use which the facred reasoners sometimes make of the Argumentum ad hominem4. They fometimes do fay things as true, and reason upon them, without feeming to mean more than that those, to whom they address themselves, will allow them to be true. And the length, to which they carry this, does not feem very easy to be ascertained. Some have thought, that St. Paul only speaks of the History of Adam in this light: and Christ of Demoniacs. But it is easy to carry the notion too far. I should keep it in mind, when I read expressions of God's hardening the heart of Pharaoh', hating Esau, and leading men into temptation: and I should consider, whether St. Paul did not fometimes, through a principle of compliance with the Jewish notions and expressions, use terms, which he might not have used to gentiles.

These remarks about additional difficulties in the language of Scripture, seem to shew, that it might be useful, in considering the Articles which follow in the second part, to try how near to each article

Book 1. Chap. x. Sect 1x.

<sup>9</sup> Book 1. Chap. xvII. Sect. xIX. near end.—Book II. Chap. II. Sect. xIII. Bp. Sherlock's Discourses, Vol. 2. p. 2. Collyer's Sacred Interpreter, Vol. 2. p. 228. Warburton on the Spirit, Pref. p. 17. also p. 175. Note.

article of revealed religion, a corresponding article of natural religion could be brought. Such an attempt might shew, that the difficulties in our way were not such as belonged peculiarly to the scriptures: and might contribute to make us satisfied with several doctrines, which are at present apt to occasion uneasiness and discontent.



# ARTICLE IX.

#### OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH-SIN.

RIGINAL Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offfpring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original Righteousness, and is of his own Nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek, Φρουημα σαρχος, which some do expound the wisdom, some fensuality, some the affection, some the defire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized; yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of fin.

Having now finished our Introduction to the second part of our 39 Articles, we proceed to the Articles themselves, contained in that Part.—In treating the ninth, we may follow our former plan, as to giving History, Explanation, Proof, and Application.

I. We

We begin with the History. And first, if we put ourselves in the place of early Christians, we cannot but think, that they must find it necessary to form *fome* doctrine concerning the finfulness of Several things in Scripture must conspire to The History of Adam, the application this end. of it by St. Paul; the lamentations of wickedness and corruption, and of man's being even conceived in fin: and these they would naturally join together; and a cause of evil being wanted, this would most naturally occur. Then justification by faith is grounded on the idea of all men's being concluded under fin; and Christians are reprefented as being born again, as if their natural birth was fo impure, that it was to be fet aside, and fomething was to be substituted in its place. Whatever these things in scripture may really mean, they are too folemn, and in appearance too fundamental to be wholly paffed over and neglected: fome doctrine must result from them.

11. What did refult, we are now to confider; but, in order to do this distinctly, we must divide the notion of original fin into two parts. thing implied in original fin, is the ftate or condition of offenders in the fight of God; the other is a mind, or fet of passions, disordered, or strongly inclining man to commit actual fin; we call this, concupiscence. - These parts are sometimes profeffed independently of each other; fometimes they are supposed to be joined together, and the vicious passions are accounted the effect of the state, in which we are born, or of Adam's transgression, which brought us into it. Sometimes original fin is taken as compounded perhaps of both, without any attention being paid to the division. Were

There is fomething like these two parts in the Necessary Doctrine, Article of Justification, beginning.

Were I to speak of this state of offenders as somewhat analogous to a state of native stavery, or of hereditary rebellion, if I may use such an expression, when families are disgraced for rebellion, and their estates are forseited, I should only mean to

give my idea, not to prove any thing.

have been struck, in different ages, with the appearance of evil; and have thought it a phænomenon so extraordinary, as to require some particular folution. (Which, by the way, must hinder any solution from appearing entirely vain and unnecessary b.)

IV. What notion the Jews had of original fin feems not fatisfactorily ascertained. Voltaire indeed has no difficulties; he says, the Jews knew nothing of the matter; and others have said the

b See Bp. Gibson's second pastoral Letter, Sect. 3. where he translates a part of Cicero's Tusc. Disp. 3, Pref. - I rather wonder he should not have translated a few words more, ut penè cum lacte nutricis errorem suxisse videamur. For, if we suppose errorem to mean what was mentioned in the preceding sentence, (which ut feems to imply,) Cicero's idea of pravitas et perversitas taken in with our Mother's milk, comes to much the fame thing as ours of birth-fin. - It might be proper also to read here Horace, Od. 3. 6. particularly ver. 1, 18, 33, 48.—The Delph. note on the opening of that Ode refers to Plato : I do not find the exact thought in Plato; but I find, in Lib. 2. de republ. (about one fourth from the beginning) that certain perfons, called ayugres nas martes, circulatores et vates, perhaps some low fort of Priests, used to go to the doors of rich men, and tell them, that, if any adianua had been committed by them or their Ancestors (weoyorws) they could appeale the Gods by Sacrifices, and (17 wo 215) incantations. Origen mentions Oracles to our purpose: Contra Celsum, Edit. Spencer, p. 403. quoted in

Div. Leg B. v. 5.

In Shakspeare's Tempest, Act 1, Scene 2. we have "thy vile race," where the Note says, "Race," in this place, seems to mean original disposition; "inborn qualities." Edit. Stockdale.—See also Dacier's Life of Pythagoras, Presace; and Vol. 2.

p. 125. 199.

See Vol. 26. 4to. index, or p. 384.

fame: and it must be confessed, that Maimonides d, in the 13th Century, faid, that no one could be born with habits, and therefore, that original fin was a thing impossible: which does rather look as if nothing had been recorded about it by the ancient Jews (fuch as had come down to Maimonides), which the moderns thought very important; or which they thought need prevent their attacking the Christians on this head: but yet, they (the ancients) must be supposed acquainted with the History of Adam, though they might find difficulties in it: they also must know of the Curses denounced against him; and of the many complaints of human depravity, which are contained in their own scriptures. Some of the Jews seem to have folved the appearance of evil by a pre-existent ftate. And it is faid, that some of them underflood the casting away of the præputium after circumcifion, was casting away corruption, at least emblematically. And they not only circumcifed. but baptized or washed those, whom they admitted into their religious community: for what was fuch cleanfing wanted? But I do not fee how Christians can deny, that the Jews in St. Paul's time had notions of what we have fince called original fin .-For St. Paul argues with Jews from Adam's transgression, to redemption by Christ: he must argue from what was well known, to that which was to be proved: therefore, whether we suppose St. Paul to believe the history of Adam, or not, in its literal f fense, we must think, that he knew the Fews

d Calmet's Dictionary, under Grace.

or his Parents, that he was born blind?" So that the man himfelf might have finned, some way or other, before he was born: or the fin of his Parents might have caused his blindness.—See Macknight on the passage.

f About the Allegorical sense of the History of the Fall, see Warb. Div. Leg. B. 9. Vol. 3. p. 640. quarto.

Jews believed it. When Christians judge concerning the notions of the Jews in this point, they forget, that it could not appear to a Jew, of the same consequence s as it does to a Christian, who esteems it the corner-stone of his own system: I look upon it therefore as a probable conclusion, that the Jews professed the Doctrine of original sin in as great a degree as they wanted it in their Religion; although those, whose writings have come down to us, may have been tempted to oppose St. Paul and the Christians on this popular ground.

v. We come next to the early Christians; that they knew nothing of our Doctrine, though affirmed by Voltaire, I do not grant: Let any one consult Wall on infant-baptism, and see the passages which he has collected from the early Fathers.

—I am mistaken if he does not allow, that they held our doctrine with as much exactness and precision as could be expected before disputes arose.

After the very early Christians, we may take all those together, who lived before the fifth Century.—
Here we have artless, unsystematical expressions, like those of scripture, sometimes implying the state, sometimes the evil propensities, as occasion required. The doctrine was as much brought into form as it could be without controversy. And when, at last, controversy did begin, it proceeded by the same degrees, which have been before described, in the case of other doctrines.—Perhaps

The principal things to attract a Christian's notice would rather make a Jew desirous of evading our Doctrine.

h Part 1. Chap. 1, 2, 3, &c.

i This must appear probable, merely from the considerations offered in our first Section.

k Art. 1. Sect. Iv. Vol. 2. p. 227. - Art. 11. Sect. 11.

it would be found, from Wall's quotations, that the doctrine grew from time to time more particular.

In this place, we may recollect what was before1 mentioned with regard to the Manicheans; as they are placed as flourishing toward the close of the third Century. By fetting up an original evil principle, they allow, that the existence of evil wants accounting for. They are, moreover, faid to have confidered the foul as originally pure, but as having contracted evil by its union with the material Body. Thus they accounted for what we call concupifcence. And in faying, that by this union the foul loft its freedom, they approach near to the idea expressed in our tenth Article. - (See Lardner's Works, Vol. 3. p. 475.) It has been thought strange, by some modern Christians, that those writers, who contended with the Manicheans, did not shew them, that the true Christian method of accounting for evil is that used in explaining the doctrine of original fin: But a good reasoner will always reason on some principles allowed by his adversaries; it would have been in vain to refer to the Old Testament, or to quotations of it in the new; for the Manicheans rejected both .-Therefore Augustin and Titus of Bostra were more logical in arguing on topics of natural Religion, than they would have been in dwelling on those of Revelation. Indeed the Hypothesis of the Manicheans, with regard to evil, was not properly Christianity, even in their own ideas, but Philosophy; Persian Philosophy, as professed long before the Christian æra. It might as well have been

Appendix to Book 1. Sect. 1v. Vol. 1. p. 348.

m See Lardner's Works, Vol. 3. p. 388.
n In the time of *Plato*, it feems to have been disputed whether Evil arose from *Matter*.—See Dacier's Plato, Vol. 1. p. 163. 165. (French).

been applied to folve the transgression itself of our first Parents, as any bad consequence of that transgression.

vi. We will now proceed to the fifth Century, to the age when the doctrine of Original Sin was brought, by the warmth of Controversy, to its

full maturity.

Pelagius is placed in the year 405: he was an Englishman, or, more strictly perhaps, a Welchman; his real name was Morgan, which is faid to mean the same as Marigena in the Latin, or IIIAayios in the Greek. He chose the Greek as best fuited, probably, to all parts of the then world. He was a Monk, but that term did not always imply one belonging to a community; only a perfon giving up worldly greatness and pleasure, and applying himself to religious pursuits. He was a man of good understanding; learned and pious; and amiable in his disposition. He had two followers, who were as much known as himfelf, Celestius, an Irishman, (Scotus), and Julianus, who was somewhere a Bishop. Pelagius was at Rome in 405, and lived in friendship with the best and most eminent of the Christians; but Rome being facked in 410, we find him in Africa, and afterwards in Palestine; Celestius remaining in Africa. He always wrote on the Trinity as an Orthodox Christian; and, when he wished to publish something against Original Sin, and the necessity of Divine Grace for Salvation, he mentioned his own opinions as if they were those of other people.-After the feeds of his doctrines were thus fown, he was less reserved about them; and at length publicly owned them to be his. As to Original Sin, he

Part 1. Chap. 19. Sect. 3. & 29.

P See Wall. Sect. 3. 

q Ibidem.

he professed, that Adam would have died, had he never offended; that he hurt only himself; and that all children are born in the same state, in which Adam was born; and in which he always remained, before his offence: yet Pelagius and his followers feem to have been fometimes fo much preffed, that they gave way as far as they poffibly could; even so as sometimes to have had some appearance of prevarication. It feems probable, from his character, that Pelagius had only in view', to hinder men from running into fancies injurious to the honour of God. He was however attacked and cenfured; and he, or his two followers abovementioned, underwent excommunication and banishment. There are reckoned up twenty-four Councils, which were held on their account, in the fifth Century, and before the death of Augustin: that is, we may fay, between 412 and 430. How much agitated must the Christian world have then been in discussing his Doctrines! He defended himself, and sent a Greed to the Pope, which is still extant: I suppose no other intire work of his remains, except a Letter to Demetrias, a female Christian, though many fragments may be found in the writings of those, who opposed him. The notion attributed to the Pelagians in our Article, only rose out of what has now been mentioned; the particular nature of it will appear under our explanation.

vii. The principal person who opposed Pelagius was Augustin: Jerom indeed did labour in the same work, but not with the same gentleness.

and

That the Pelagians argued to this purpose, is said by Wall,

These works are, I think, in the last Volume of Augustin's Works: Edit. Benedict... They are also amongst Jerom's works.

Bower's Lives of the Popes, Vol 1. p. 329.

and candour. Indeed the more I fee of Augustin's works, the more I am pleased with his character: he was certainly an open and zealous opponent of Pelagius; but I cannot with fatisfaction call him an enemy: for, though he has written a great " deal against the Pelagians, he " always speaks of" Pelagius himself "as a man of extraordinary capacity and accomplishments; and one, whom he should much admire and love, were it not for his heterodox opinions." - It has been charged upon Augustin, that, whilst he was writing against the Manicheans, he wrote in defence of free-will, and that when he came to write against the Pelagians, he depreciated it. We know he was capable of retracting an error on perceiving it; but yet it is possible he might seem to contradict himself when he did not; as is the case with the Scriptures. The Manichean servitude of the Will is, in its nature, distinct from any scriptural notion; fo that an idea of free-will might be maintained in opposition to that, which should be no way inconfistent with our Doctrines of Original Sin and Indeed I am not aware, that Free-will, in Grace. the common sense of the word, is understood to be taken away by either of those doctrines. To examine Augustin's works on this question, would carry us too far out of our way. I will only observe farther, that both Pelagius and Augustin seem to have been able and worthy men. In modern times, they are spoken of too hastily. The only aim of Pelagius might be, to defend the justice and goodness of God; the only aim of Augustin, to defend the Christian Religion, or keep its doctrines strictly scriptural: at the same time, Pelagius was a true Christian, and Augustin a true believer in the divine justice and goodness.

VIII. After

<sup>&</sup>quot; Cave - Augustin. in Hist. Lit. \* Wall 19. Sect. 29.

VIII. After giving my own idea of this celebrated æra of the Pelagian controversy, it is natural to mention one or two writers, from whom others may feek information relative to it. Dr. fortin is a favourite author, but his remarks on Ecclefiastical History do not quite hit my fancy: He appears to me in them, to have a kind of flippancy, which does not fuit a man of his character in other respects; it always reminds me of a school-boy, who, having acquired some talent for writing, uses it in ridiculing those, from whom he has received instruction, and who ought to be the objects of his veneration or respect. He seems, in this work, one of that class, who consider ingenuity as confifting in pulling to pieces every thing that is established; and liberality of mind, in striking out fomething fingular, which shall relax habitual reverence, and indulge the prefumption and petulence of the forward and inconsiderate. He seems to make no allowances for the customary follies and weaknesses of different ages and countries, but to try all men, as if they had every advantage of modern improvement.

I should depend much more on the information, which is to be gathered from Wall's History of Infant Baptism. Original Sin being one great cause of Infant Baptism, an History of Infant-baptism is, in a manner, an History of Original Sin. This writer is very well informed, grave, sensible, attentive, and candid: indulgent, not only to those whose opinions he favours, but to all who deserve indulgence, whatever opinions they

prefer.

1x. Not long after the rise of the Pelagians, there seem to have arisen some, who thought that the Pelagians were right in some respects, but that they had carried matters too far. These were called

Semi-

Semi-pelagians; probably, not by themselves. As the tenets of those who had this name have occafioned fome dispute, we must not enter upon the fubject very minutely. We may conceive the title to have been given lightly, whenever any perfons mitigated the Doctrines, either of the Orthodox or the Pelegians; and, as this might be done in various particulars, various opinions might come to be called Semipelagiany.—As to our present subject, it used to be called a notion of Semipelagians, that those, who died under years of discretion, would be rewarded or punished according as they would have been good or bad, had they 2 lived. If you ask whether this is meant of baptized or unbaptized, they would answer, God decreed, that those should be baptized, who would have behaved well. Whereas Augustin is said to have held, that God decreed that certain Infants should be baptized, and fo they were faved of course; (I now fpeak only Historically). - This approaches too near the subject of Predestination to be considered at present.-And, as we shall meet the Semipelagians again under the tenth and feventeenth Articles, we will dismiss them now. Any one may confult Mosheim, Cent. v. 2. 5. 26.

x. The Mahommedans feem to acknowledge a fomething of native corruption in Man, as they think it necessary to fettle some way, in which their Prophet is freed from it. An angel, I think, plucked a black grain out of his heart, or squeezed three droops of black blood from it, and then he was cleansed from the pollution of humanity.

xi. The

y Of Pelagians and Semipelagians see more Art. xv11. Sect.

Bower's Life of Zosimus, p. 350. Vol. 1. Wall, Chap. 19. end.

All

x1. The School-men refined upon our Doctrine, and entered into curious questions concerning the nature of Original Sin, and the manner in which it descended from one generation to anotherb; but, as our Article does not require any fuch inveftigations, and as the Schoolmen are expressly mentioned under the thirteenth Article, we may difmiss

them for the present.

XII. We may proceed to the Age of the Reformation.—The general idea is, that, though we differed from the Romanists in many things, we did not c differ with regard to Original Sin. Which may be right enough; yet there feems to be a verbal difference, at leaft, between our present Article and the Decree of the Council of Trent .- We fay, "the infection" remains after Baptism; they say, original fin is taken away by Baptism; but all we mean by "the infection" is concupifcence, which they allow does remain: we fay, concupifcence "has the nature of Sin:" they allow, that the Apostle calls it Sin; but not firictly; only because it comes of Sin, and leads to Sin; which feems to be our reason for calling it Sin. Such a difference as this feems ' fcarcely worth dwelling upon, though the expressions seems to be intentionally opposed. The flate of offenders may be changed or superfeded, though the mental corruption may require a course of discipline to change it.

The Anabaptists are particularly mentioned in the Article of 1552, and in the Reformatio E Legum.

c See Heylin's Historia Quinquarticularis, p. 518.

d Seffion 5th.

e See Rhemists on Rom. ix. 11.

B De Hæresibus, cap. 7.

One need only confult the Index to Thomas Aquinas, under Peccatum Originale.

f The 5th Session of the Council of Trent, was held, A. D.

All those, seemingly, who are against infant-bap-

tism, must deny original sin.

Martin Luther is very ftrong in his expressions against those, who let down the Doctrine of original finh. It fuited his temper to be fo, and his

views of Justification.

Strype fays', that it was common in England for men to call each other Free-willers and Pelagians, by way of Opprobrium: So that introducing Pelagians into our Article would not, at the time, feem uncouth or strange; as I fear it does now, to many readers.

XIII. The Calvinists and Arminians must of course differ about Original Sin; as will appear when we come to fpeak of them more particularly

hereafterk.

xIV. The Socinians have varied their ground confiderably: The Racovian Catechism fays of Man, that he was created mortal: and then for Adam's offence, he (man) was decreed to eternal death.—Afterwards, "omnes homines eò quòd ex eo nati funt, eidem eternæ morti fubjaceant."—In a subsequent chapter m, " Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est." This may be acknowledging, that men are now in a flate worse in some way than before Adam's offence; but denying that the mental corruption observable in the world, has any connexion with it.

Dr.

1 Annals, Vol. 1. p. 331.

It might be mentioned, that our Puritans, particularly the affembly of Divines were Calvinistic; especially as John Taylor has strictures on the Assembly's Catechism. - See Taylor on

original Sin, p. 90. &c.

h See his Work on Genefis, Vol. 6. Folio.

k It feems enough at present to read a few Heads out of the Indexes to Calvin's Institutes, and Arminius's Works.—Near the end of Arminius's Volume, there is a fort of fummary of his opinions,

De via Salutis, Cap. 1. p. 15, &c. A Cap. 10. de Libero Arbitrio.

Dr. John Taylor, the celebrated Author of a work on the Epistle to the Romans, is a very respectable writer. He has published a volume on the subject of Original Sin. His notion is, that "Death, Labour and Sorrow" came into the world by Adam's sin, and that we, the descendants of Adam, are subject to Death, Labour and Sorrow merely on account of his Trangression. He owns that, in sact, there is great corruption in the world, but he does not join this corruption to the History of our first Parent. He holds, that Virtue must be pa man's own; that no man can be virtuous or vicious for another. (Which, by the way, seems

wandering from original to actual fin).

Dr. 9 Priestley fets out with Taylor's words, "Labour, forrow, and death;" and fupposes, that though "the mind may be more feeble, and therefore more prone to comply with fome temptations," by "the body being more subject to disease," yet as fickness does some moral good, "it is probable" "upon the whole" "that our condition is more favourable to Virtue than that of Adam."-But afterwards he feems to quit Taylor's ground, and deny, that the Sin of Adam was imputed to subject men to death: he seems also to make Death the recompence of "actual and personal Sins."-He is afraid to take Taylor's ground; and, if I understand them right, Taylor would be very unwilling to take his; for he (Taylor) reasons copiously on Adam's offence as bringing death on mankind. -Either there is much unsteadiness among the Socinians, (which shews a want of satisfaction) or I am not able rightly to comprehend their opinions.

xv. It

1 Page 13.

n Taylor, p. 27, 30. 37. 164. Page 98.

P Page 127. 190. 4 Famil. Illustr. p. 11.

xv. It seems needless to offer more historical accounts here, especially as, from the connexion of this Article with those that follow it, we may expect to meet with the same persons and sects again. We are to come now to the Explanation; the intent of which is, to clear up the terms of our Article in such a manner, that the propositions contained in it shall be intelligible, and require nothing but such proof as the mind can easily attend to.

" Original Sin" has been usually opposed to actual Sin: it is called "birth-fin," because men fall into it by Birth; either by being fo born as to appear in the state of offenders; or by being born in fuch circumstances, that their propensities will, in the common course of things, be disorderly. —(See Section the fecond). Human beings are fupposed to have no concern with any other fort of Sin till they come to have fome fort of felf-govern-But, when members of any community are faid to offend, as fuch, it is worth observing, that they may be all the while perfectly innocent in their individual capacity. A Corporation, or a City, a Regiment, or an University, may behave so ill as to deferve and bring on extermination; yet there may be in such worthless Body the most virtuous Man that ever lived: Notwithstanding, this virtuous man may, as a citizen, be faid to behave ill or offend, because the citizens offend collectively: these two different ways of offending, in the social and individual capacities, should never be confounded. In order to keep them distinct, I would call the fin of the individual proper fin; and that of the member of a Body, as fuch, by way of contradiffinction, improper fin. I should hope this diftinction would be intelligible, and if so, I doubt not of its being very useful, in folving objections to the doctrine

doctrine of original Sin.—And punishment may be distinguished into proper and improper, in the same sense.—I do not expect this explanation of terms to give sull satisfaction at present. Original sin is not mentioned in Scripture, in so many words.

xvii. It "standeth," or consisteth, "not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,"-" fabulantur.") - The word "following" here may mislead an English reader; it means imitating, acting as Adam acted, finning after Adam's example. The Latin is, "in imitatione Adami:" we find the English word following for imitating, in Scripture. The word "Followers," is always, in our Bible, the English for μιμηται, that is, six times; in the passage Eph. v. 1. " Be ye therefore followers of God," and five other passages .- The Pelagians, by this idea, feem to exclude both our parts of Original Sin, the flate of offenders, and the disorder of human propensities; they make it to confift in acting after a certain model or Original: and therefore, in effect, speak only of actual sin, and annihilate original. Augustin's reasoning against them agrees with this notion; and in King Edward's intended Laws, in the Chapter against Herefy, those are censured, who reduce original fin to this, quòd ex Adami delicto propofitum "fit peccandi noxium exemplum, quod homines ad eandem pravitatem invitat imitandam et usurpandam."

fault and corruption of the Nature of every man," &c.

<sup>\*</sup> Ep. 88.89. or, in the new order, 156, 157, from and to Hilarius.—See the passages translated in Wall on Infant Baptism, p. 179. 2d. Edition.—And in Nicholls on the Article, p. 73.

&c. Fault in the Latin is vitium, which seems always to imply a fort of comparison between what is and what might be; or would be, if things were as they were intended to be. Sometimes the vitium, or fault, is defect, sometimes excess, sometimes a change, after the manner of putrefaction, or corruption; so that, in some views the words, fault and corruption coincide, though fault has the more extensive meaning.—" Infection" varies the idea a little; but language about the mind is all com-

parative.

If we consider what we mean by the Nature of any thing, we shall find it something of this fort: that combination and relative strength of its different powers, on which the effecting of its peculiar end and purpose depends. The Nature of any thing is corrupted, when any of these powers is too much diminished to answer that end; or so much encreased as to overpower others, and prevent their executing their proper office. The nature of a Watch is corrupted, when the spring is become too strong, or too weak; or when any of the wheels are clogged, retarded, accelerated, beyond the velocity intended for it by the maker. Nature of any particular civil Government is corrupted, when the people have diminished the constitutional power of the King or Senate; or when these have diminished the constitutional power of the people; fo that the political machine cannot promote Security, &c. in that way which was intended by those who framed it .- But what is the Nature of Man? He is a very nice and complicated machine; confifts of a great number of powers, fome of which impell, others reftrain; they are all intended to act together, each with its proper force, and in its own manner, fo as to promote the greatest good which can be called human. Every man fees this himself in some degree, but the

the description of the human constitution given by Bishop Butler in his three Sermons on human nature, may be recommended as the best extant. -Conscience is the constitutional Supreme: extenfive prudence and benevolence have great authority; and of many passions and appetites, together with the fenfes, there is some which has not its proper work and department, though under controul of fuperiors. Any one who has once acquired a right idea of our Nature, will find no difficulty in feeing wherein confifts its corruption. fensual pursuits prevent intellectual attainments; when appetites overpower prudence and benevolence; when passions rebel against Conscience, and continue in a state of rebellion, then may our Nature be faid to be corrupted: or even if the inferior principles are only troublesome, seditious, as it were, and turbulent; do not yield eafily and freely to those powers, which ought to be superior to theirs.

In order to see the right sense of nature, natural, &c. in common Life, (and therefore in Scripture,) we might observe, in what sense it is said, that an Englishman naturally speaks English: this seems to mean, that it is according to the common course of Nature that a person born in any country should speak the language of that country. But here is no idea of compulsion or necessity; he may speak a foreign language.—The best mode of learning the sense of words is from such common expressions as these.

As we are speaking of *Nature*, we may take, in this place, the expression, "is of his own *Nature* inclined to evil:" it seems to mean, not that man is *irresistibly* impelled to evil; and that this is seen in

Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 127.

in his constitution; in fast only it appears, that the inferior propensities have too great influence in our constitution; so constantly, that an expectation is raised of finding the same thing in future instances.

XIX. The expression, "every man, that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam," feems to me an expression of some nicety: The word, "naturally," feems only intended to exclude our Saviour from original fin, his birth being supernatural; but I mean to take the expression independently of this word. Does it mean only, every man?'-all men are, "engendered of the offspring of Adam:"-or does it mean, that every man is inclined to evil naturally because he is sprung from the first offender?—I should rather think, that the intention of the compilers was, to leave men a liberty of affenting, who should doubt whether the disorderly propensities of man were owing to Adam's transgression; though to omit Adam entirely, in this place, would have given offence to many. My reason is, because many serious and thinking Christians have judged, that the first part of Genefis is not a literal description of fact, but an allegorical 'ftory (like the Pilgrim's progress?); now it was probably far from the intention of our Church to exclude any fuch; and if this clause was made with a view to giving liberty to them, it must, though perhaps accidentally in some measure, give liberty to those, who understand, " every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam," as meaning no more than, every man.

xx. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>t</sup> See Div. Leg. B. 9. in Warburton's Works, quarto, Vol. 3. p. 640,

The next expression we come to is, "Original righteousness:" - the primitive " meaning of which is, that righteousness, which our First Parents had before their Fall.—They are not described as having offended immediately after they were created; and if they did not, their minds must have been pure, though inexperienced; free from shame and remorfe; and their conscience cheering: - and had they and their offspring continued in such a state, while their experience increafed, it is not conceivable, that, in later generations, the lower and groffer appetites would have been disorderly in the manner we now find them: but I mean not here to reason, farther than is necesfary for the explanation of the idea affixed to the words " original righteousness "."

This original righteousness, though spoken of only as in fact belonging to our first parents, must be, in its kind, such rectitude of mind, such a combination and relative strength of mental powers, as God originally intended for man; such as he adapted to procure his greatest good. May we not therefore understand "original righteousness" in that sense? without relation to Adam, or to man's ever having actually been in a state of such righteousness?—And so only mean, by man's being "far gone

<sup>12</sup> See Necessary Doctrine, on Free-will and Justification.—Also Heylin's Historia Quinquart. p. 513. And first Paragraph of Homily on the Nativity.

<sup>\*</sup> We might digress so far here, as to give a conjectural idea of the situation of our first Parents before their fall: some would fay, it had better be omitted; but my purpose would be, to shew what the situation might be; on this principle, that if any situation could be described consistent with the short account of Scripture, it would follow, that the scriptural account is not objectionable.—Any one might read Archbp. King's Sermon on the Fall, and my Poem on Redemption, v. 115—122.—If this be done, Div. Leg. Book 1x. (former part) should be attended to.

from original righteousness," that every man is at a great distance from that frame of mind which our Creator intended, for us? Dr. Balguy's manner of speaking of the act of our first Parents as of one " of which we are very obscurely and imperfectly informed," feems rather to imply, that he would not lay much stress on a state so little understood.

This feems the proper place to take some notice of the expression, "God made" man in his own image;" as it is fometimes, though not in our Article, made a proof of actual original righteousness. The expression seems to me indefinite and comparative: Man might be faid to be like the intelligent Creator in comparison of other earthly things. Adam begat Seth after his own b image; that is, so that his son should be of the same nature, and in the fame fituation with himfelf: in like manner, we now bear the image of Adam, as far as we are men; as Christians, we are described as to be conformed to the image of Christ, which means the same as putting on the new Man: we must labour to acquire the true Christian disposition; and then the words of St. Paule will be applicable to us; "as we have born the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Bishop Warburton Div. Leg. B. q. makes Reason

to be the image of God, in Adam.

XXII. We now come to an expression, which is more terrible in the found than in the fense. "It (original fin) deferveth God's wrath and damnation." The wrath of God can only mean the

The Golden age of the Heathens implies diffatisfaction with the present age: shews (if not borrowed from Scripture) that the idea of original righteousness is natural.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Charge 2d. p. 200. <sup>2</sup> Gen. i. 27.—ix. 6.

b Gen. v. 3. d Eph. iv. 24.

c Rom. viii. 29.

e i Cor. xv. 49. f See Book i. Chap. xix. Sect. v.

cause, in God, of such effects as, in man, would be produced by wrath. It is not implied, that wrath must actually be exercised on all who are subject to original sin; they only deserve it, or are liable to it. They are called the "children s of wrath,"—but children in scripture are not always supposed to inherit. The children of this world do not always inherit h this world; nor can the children of light inherit light.—Damnation is only equivalent to judgment'; it does not, of itself, imply judgment after k death, nor does it imply any determinate degree of evil: It is as applicable to the Socinian scheme as to any other; as Taylor himself contends. (p. 29, &c) .- A verdiet against any one, in our civil judicatures, is judgment, or damnation, how small soever the fine. But we are going too far in speaking as if any judgment must be passed, or any fine levied: men are often liable to punishment in some theory of Law, who are never punished, or so much as sentenced to punishment. As is the case, in our country, with those who continue affembled after the Riot-act has been read.

how many expressions of our Article are immediately taken from Scripture. "The sless lusteth always contrary to the Spirit," seems to be Gal. v. 17. with a reference to Rom. vii. 7. &c. and ver. 23.—"wrath," alludes to Eph. ii. 3.—"damnation," refers to Rom. v. ver. 16. or 18. only we should observe, that, if we take the latter verse, our article rather softens the expression of scripture; χριμα, judgment, or damnation, being a softer term than κατακριμα, condemnation: Φρονημα σαρχος

<sup>8</sup> Eph. ii. 3.

i 1 Cor xi. 29, margin.

h Matt. v. 5.

k Ver. 30.

is taken from Rom. viii, 6. —and " is not subject to the Law of God," from Rom. viii. 7 .- "There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized," is from Mark xvi. 16. and Rom. viii. 1.—" The Apostle doth confess, that concupifcence and lust hath of itself the nature of Sin:" this may refer to feveral places; as Rom. vi. 12.— Rom. vii. 7. &c. but this latter feems sufficient: "I had not known Sin but by the Law, for I had not known Luft," (επιθυμιαν, translated in the margin, and in other passages, concupiscence,) "except the Law had faid, thou shalt not covet."-Mr. Locke paraphrases, "I had not known Lust," "I had not known concupifcence to be Sin."— These passages are not mentioned here as proofs, but only to give the reader a right notion of what is composed in our Article, and what is quoted. interpretation is yet given of any passage; yet it feems as if our propositions would scarcely be cleared from all extraneous matter, without an explanatory remark on one or two fcriptural expressions; as Φρουημα σαρχος, and, " is not subject to the Law of God."

which is so very near the phrase "born again," that it may be reckoned scriptural; "renatis" must be reckoned so, which is the word in our Latin Article: though we should see in what sense it was used, when our Articles were compiled.—Wall fays, "'tis abundantly evident, that the common phrase of the Jews, was to call the Baptism of a Proselyte, his Regeneration, or new Birth.—And the Christians did in all ancient times continue the use of this name for Baptism." This remark he applies to John iii. 3.—In our Article, the Latin word for "regenerated" is "renatis;" and "renatis,"

in this same Article, is the Latin for "baptized;" whence it appears, that our Article means the same thing by "regenerated," and "baptized,"-Some may apprehend danger from this remark, as if it let down regeneration to mean only the external form of baptism: but I do not see how it does that; when shall we complete our contract? when shall we fign and feal? these being used for one another, does not let down contracting to the mere outward ceremony of fealing. The outward part, in a fymbolical act, must always imply the thing fignified: that is, in Baptism, putting on the new " man, or acquiring the true Christian disposition. When we speak of entering on any state of Life, as by manumission, indentures, marriage, &c. we take for granted the ordinary effects: they pass unmentioned, because it seems needless to mention them.

xxv. The fense of Φρουημα σαρχος might be fought in Lexicons, which indeed give a fatisfactory account; but three verses of the passage, from which the expression is taken, would be sufficient of themselves.—I mean Rom. viii. 5, 6, 7. τα της σαρχος Φρουκσιν, " mind the things of the flesh," think of them, relish them, are interested about them; this expression explains what is meant by Φεουημα, the minding, &c .- the understanding and feelings are both concerned; which they are in Indeed they are naturally the word Sentiment. much connected, because we think of that which we enjoy. Hence Φρουημα σαρκος has been thought. well translated in our version, because mind contains both understanding and feelings, or both forts of sentiments. The English and Latin articles give us each four words to chuse out of; which I only mention as a specimen of the liberality of the compilers in interpreting; the same

<sup>\*</sup> Eph. iv. 22, 23, 24.

<sup>·</sup> Parkhurst's Lexicon.

158 BOOK IV. ART. IX. SECT. XXVI. XXVII.

that, I should imagine, they intend us to use on all occasions.

not subject to the Law of God:" that is to say, allowing the inferior propensities of our nature to take up our attention, so that we cannot attend to the higher principles, is keeping them in a state of rebellion to Nature, and the author of Nature.—

The Apostle, not the Article, adds, "neither indeed can be;" which may mean, it is not possible, that such a state should be any other than a state of Rebellion. God having fixed and settled our constitution to be such, that conscience and enlarged self-love shall have authority over the desires of the Flesh.

I do not observe any other expressions in our Article, which want clearing up, and therefore I here close the Explanation. Nothing is affirmed concerning Death being introduced into the world by Adam's disobedience; nor indeed about man's being made in the image of God, though I have touched upon that expression.

Proof of the propositions, which our Article contains.... I cannot perceive more than four propositions.

1. Original Sin consists in the corruption of our

nature, or mental constitution.

2. Into our state of corruption, there is some reason to conclude, that we were brought by the offence of our first Parents.

3. Whatever

P See Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 123.

It might indeed be observed, that concupiscence having the Nature of Sin," is distinguishable from its being Sin, as murder is sin: but we have already (Sect. x11.) described it as coming of sin, and leading to sin. And more will appear, relating to concupiscence, in what follows: particularly in the latter part of Sect. xxx.

3. Whatever strictness of propriety there may be in calling this state a state of Sin, we have ground to confider it as making us liable to what may be called a judicial sentence.

4. Not only mere men, but Christians, are capable of finful concupifcence, or mental cor-

ruption.

In the proof of the first proposition, XXVIII. I find a difficulty. Original Sin is not a scriptural expression, and yet all we want is to establish a set of doctrines on scriptural foundation. What then is the question here between us and our adversaries? The best idea I can acquire, is this. is fomething in Scripture, which has given occasion to the expression original Sin: so that this expresfion has become established; and all parties have made some use of it; but it has suited best with the notions of one party to use it in one sense, and with those of another party, to use it in a different fense. The question seems to be, which speaks with the greatest propriety, or most according to the true meaning of Scripture? The Orthodox fays, it confifts in mental depravity; the Pelagian, wishing only to deny, that there is any fuch thing as depravity in any human being when he is born, speaks to this purpose; if you will have such a thing as original fin, I do not fee to what you can give that name, but to fin as committed after the example of our first Parent, taken in the light of a model or original.-Now therefore, if we can prove, what they wish to deny, that mental depravity is a thing, which may be called hereditary; or that it is a thing which does depend, in some measure, upon our Birth; we feem to prove the only thing which is needful. The fast is allowed, that men are

So that the first of our four propositions may stand thus: our corrupt nature may be looked upon as, in some degree, hereditary;

very corrupt; and Dr. John Taylor allows of the word degenerate'; but he will have it, that each man's moral corruption depends wholly upon 'him-felf. For authority of Scripture consult here, Gen. viii. 21.—Psalm li. 5.—lviii. 3.—cvi. 6.—and Job xiv. 4.—These passages, if they are taken literally, make men, in some way or other, to have a pollution even from their birth; and if they are construed with latitude, as declamatory expressions, it does not seem easy to explain them without supposing a mental depravity or corruption in men, such as would not have been found in any man, had he been the first human being.

On these scriptural expressions, reason and experience will furnish the best comment. What then do we see and observe? That human Beings have different minds, different principles and feelings, according to the circumstances in which they are born. Savages have savage principles and passions: An Algerine feels differently, from an Englishman, in treating a Captive: and so on. Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws would afford many instances, of different principles and passions handed down from generation to generation, in different societies of

men.

It may be faid, mens different principles and passions depend, not on propagation, but on education, in a large sense of the word, as including sympathy, and all the effects of living together;—consultation. But first, what is the cause of Education, or sympathy? you must not say education is the cause, and so go back for ever ".... The question, bow

hereditary; inafmuch as it depends, in some measure, on the circumstances of our Birth.'

Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 98. 125.
Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 58, Note \*.

u Perhaps it would be answered, the cause of bad education is bad choice, bad use of powers, in those who educate: so it is, in some

how far propagation is concerned in handing down mental depravity, was, I think, one of those which was given up\*; and indeed if we know not how diseases of body descend, it is not likely that we should understand the descent of qualities of the mind. The word "engendered," in our article, may feem to favour the idea of descent by propagation; but it is scarcely intended to require us to adopt fuch idea, strictly and exclusively. We are concerned, in Scripture and Articles, with popular, not philosophical language; and that seems to regard any thing as hereditary, which is handed down from one generation to another, in a course of Nature<sup>2</sup>. It is probable, that qualities of mind are fometimes continued by propagation, as well as by fympathy, instruction, praise and blame, &c. and it feems as if the causes of such continuance are often not clearly difcerned; which may be one reason why popular language does not try to distinguish them. Children resemble their Parents in features: is this by propagation, or sympathy? perhaps by neither wholly; yet it is ordinarily ascribed wholly to propagation. However, Infanity

fome measure; but traditional error, and habitual mental dif-

orders, cause bad education in a much greater degree.

\* The authority for this was not distinctly enough noted down, and is now forgotten.—Yet it may possibly refer to what was said, Sect. x1. about the Schoolmen having entered into niceties (particularly, I suppose, about propagation) which we do not meddle with.

y Sect. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor, p. 124, ascribes the corruption of many men to Seth's posterity intermarrying with the Cainites. He did not mean to ascribe wickedness to propagation, but he mentions a fast (supposed true) which might be mentioned here. He ascribes what we should rather call the joint effects of propagation and sympathy, sometimes to one, and sometimes to the other.

is a striking instance of mental disorder handed down by propagation; and bodily qualities, which are allowed to be propagated, (Taylor, p. 192), do frequently increase or diminish the strength of mental powers. We have before referred to a paffage of Horace, where he makes fortitude to depend on breed. (Od. 3. 6. 33).—I have been told, that the Scrofula, which is reckoned the most hereditary of all bodily disorders, affects the intellects.—Mr. Ludlam, paraphrafing "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," says b, " that which is of the breed and race of fallen man, has by birth and nature, the carnal and corrupt affections that belong to all the race of fallen man." And this fentence is a kind of reference to experience; with regard to the breed of Animals in general. The ancients were aware of the influence of good parentage in Brutes; though they might not enter into all the niceties of modern pedigree. - Bien né, in French c, means one who has good inclinations: and amongst us, a wellbred man means a man of polished fentiments. good families (in different ranks) there is a fomething, which we value, whether we are looking out for Patrons, friends, or fervants; fomething good in the disposition; we are led to ascribe this to birth, though we know it is in part owing to early living with good people.—Vice may possibly diminish it, virtue may strengthen it; but its reality is acknowledged in practice: and it arises from the The quacircumstances in which a person is born. lities of body and mind conveyed down by propagation, we do not as yet precifely understand; we cannot tell beforehand the degree, in which any quality of Parents will appear in their descendants; but the general notion, that all forts of human

a John iii. 6. c Dict. Acad.

b Essay on Scrip. Metaphors, p. 4.

human qualities may be propagated, or transmitted to posterity, seems sufficiently established. And still more clearly the notion, that moral qualities, good and bad, descend from generation to genera-

tion, in a course of Nature.

It seems to follow, from what has been said, that the prevalence (not necessary, nor invincible, but usual, probable) of inferior and sensual appetites in our constitution, may depend, and is generally understood to depend, upon the circumstances, in which we are born; and therefore, that such disorder and irregularity may be called Original or Birth-Sin.

think that we were brought by the Offence of our first Parents."—I say some reason, because the History of our first Parents is faint, obscure and imperfect; and has been differently understood by

candid and thinking Christians.

The principal authority for the opinon, that the offence of Adam was, in some degree, the cause of our corruption, is the reasoning of St. Paul in the fifth Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, where he compares the effects of Adam's transgression with those of Christ's obedience. reasoning, it must be confessed, is not perfectly clear and perspicuous; yet I think a candid and attentive reader of it will at least find a very fufficient apology for any Church, which should profess the orthodox doctrine. We may begin with the 12th verse, and read to the end of the Chapter. The 13th and 14th verses seem intended to prevent any one's thinking, that the death of men, after Adam, was owing to their own offences, or actual fins: those between Adam and Moses, having

d Dr. Balguy, p. 200, as before,

having no Law, might be looked upon as free from mortal fin: yet they died; their death must therefore, supposing death caused by some sin, have been owing to Adam's offence, and inherited from The 18th and 19th verses, according to our translation, are very strong; and I believe our translation to be on the whole a very good one: not faultless, but better than any we are likely to have in this age. The passage now before us will recur very foon; therefore we may now pass on to another proof. The necessity of being born again shews, that there was fomething faulty or deficient in our natural birth; and when could the fault begin, but with our first parent, if it belongs to all mankind? " that which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit:" Taylor says , that this means no more than that the natural birth produces only the powers of a man; the spiritual birth produces "a man fanctified into the right use and application of those powers in a state of holiness."—The difference between generation and regeneration is here rightly described, supposing no fault in the parents which could affect the offspring; but this idea does not feem to me to come up to what is implied in the word "flesh," confidering the many places of scripture, in which that word denotes the vicious prevalence of carnal appetites. Regeneration, or entering on a Christian scheme of purifying our nature, does not feem to be described as if it were intended merely to lessen the hazard of abusing our natural powers; but as if its pro-

e See some passages in Taylor, p. 44. Note; they explain how the idea of Death, as a penalty, is included in the scriptural notion of the word Law.

See John iii. 5, 6.

g On Orig. Sin, p. 146.

per end were, to correct some abuse, or moral evil,

already existing.

I own myself unable to believe, that, if Adam and his Race had continued faultless, we should have been, in point of disposition, passion, sentiment, what we are now. Savages have, as was before observed, savage dispositions; can we avoid concluding, on the contrary, that, after an uninterrupted succession of virtuous generations, our dispositions would have been virtuous?

When I fee the good produced by a few good fuccessive generations, in one family, parish, &c. I could be in raptures at the thoughts of what we should all have been now, had our predecessors

been virtuous.

The Socinians (or at least John Taylor, the most eminent of of them) hold, that all generations of men have experienced forrow, merely in confequence of the first Transgression. Sorrow is in the mind; the fentiments then are affected by the Fall? we are approaching very near to passions and appetites. When forrow is excessive, or even defective, it is the "fault and corruption" of our nature:—but then forrow is not made excessive or defective by the Fall, in the Socinian idea.—It feems however here as if it were only fome apprehension of consequences which kept us asunder:for we do not hold, that our passions are necessarily and unavoidably excessive or defective; but only, that from experience it is to be expected, on a footing of probability, that they will be fo: in the fame fense, in which Scripture fays, "Offences must needs h come."

xxx. Our third proposition is, Original Sin makes men liable to Judgment.—Or, with whatever propriety

h Matt. xviii. 7.

propriety original fin may be called fin, with the fame may we fay, that punishment is due to it. As proper punishment is due to proper fin, so may we look upon that evil, which men suffer through the fins of their predecessors, and which is often popularly called punishment, though not in strictness of propriety, as due to such fins in different generations taken collectively.

But there are some prejudices, which may hinder this truth from being accepted; these should be done away before the proof can have its effect.

It seems always to be presumed, when it is said, such conduct deserves punishment, or, it must excite the divine displeasure, that it of course is punished. It is amazing how often this is presumed, even in good writers; as if God had given up his power of remission: as if every man amenable to the Law, was punished by the Law. I take the cause of this fallacy to be, a strong inward sentiment; an indignation at the sufferings of innocence, an horror at the dreadful state, in which a man's imagination paints his brethren to be, not without a distant reference to himself: this shock throws Reason out of her seat.

Men have also a reluctance in coming into the opinion, that God will punish different generations collectively. Not so much when the thing is expressed in this form, as when they come to speak of innocent men suffering for what, as individuals, they have not committed. Then their reasonings about this matter are continually warped. But is their reluctance reasonable? God does punish men collectively

This want of strict propriety is too much infisted on by Taylor, p. 21. See before, Sect. xv1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>k</sup> Sect. xx11.

<sup>1</sup> Ludlam on Divine Mercy, p. 47. Note.

collectively in various ways. It appears in his Government, he confesses it in his word. Supposing this unjust, that is nothing to us, at prefent; what the Author of Nature does, what the Scriptures declare, that is our foundation; we go no deeper. Were we defending truths of natural Religion, we might ask why the Author of Nature does fo:-Were we defending the divine authority of the Scriptures, we might ask whether what is faid of Jehovah is confiftent with the true character of the one supreme wise and good Being; but we are not defending scripture; we are reasoning upon it, taking its divine authority for granted. Not that it would detain us long from our proper business, to see, that a good Governor may unite men together by fometimes rewarding and fometime punishing them jointly, whenever union amongst them is that which promotes their greatest good.

Another thing to be mentioned here, as continually preventing reason from having its proper effect, is, confounding two different punishments together; I mean, the punishment of the individual, and the punishment of the community. God sometimes punishes one, sometimes the other, and, as the punishment of the community affects the individual, so the punishment of the individual in some measure affects the community: but if the ideas are not kept distinct, dispute and confusion must ensue. How often have men complained, that the punishment of the individual was unjust, when in reality there was no punishment of the individual, but only one of the community, which affected the the individual incidentally, and

by

by a Law calculated to promote the general good"!

We will now, without attempting to remove

more prejudices, proceed to our proof.

It will not be denied, that there are feveral passages of scripture which represent men collectively as standing before God in the light of sinners: read Rom. iii. 9. & 19, with marginal translation: Rom. v. 6, 8, 10 -Gal. iii. 22.-If it be faid, that this is meant as the effect of actual fin°, my difficulty is this; when men are spoken of as amenable to law as individuals, they should be spoken of individually; the peculiar circumstances of each individual should be stated; for, in that light, every man will be subject to a sentence of his own; one different from the rest .-And if men are spoken of as punishable collectively, it will make no difference whether you collect different generations, or different cotemporaries.

Now, that the Scriptures do represent men as to be considered, nay as to be rewarded or punished, collectively,

To what was faid, Sect. xvi. we may add here, that the fin and punishment of a Community may be what we have called a proper fin and punishment. This is the case when a community sins as a community, and is punished as a community: Sin and punishment are only what we have called improper, when a man, innocent as an individual, is a member of a community which fins, and when he therefore fins only in his social capacity; and is punished only in his social capacity.—

Families are communities; a member of a family may offend and suffer as such, (in family quarrels) when in his private capacity he is kind to the inimical family, and beloved in return.—

This illustration brings to one's mind the Play of Romeo and Juliet; the more common the instance, the more it will serve to shew, that we must not turn from the distinction here offered, as abstructe: we all make and acknowledge it continually.

Taylor, p. 116.254.

collectively, may peafily be proved .- confidered , as when Levi' paid tithes in Abraham, to Melchizedec; rewarded, as when Abraham' was made Father of the faithful; punished, as when God declares, that he himself will visit the fins' of the Fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generations:-Suppose any man of one of those generations, to be born; would not he appear in this world in the light of a finner? or, at least, as one of a number which stood in that light? One might add the instances of Esau", Canaan\*, and others; but why should we go lower than our first parents? a sentence of this fort on them, is a sentence on the whole race of man. Taylor will not allow, that the sentence on Adam was a curse?: it feems clear to me, that what was pronounced upon him, was an infliction of evil, in confequence of his Offence: a condemnation: and this appears from Taylor's own reasoning on Rom. v. 19.—If only his posterity was spoken of in this fentence, and not himself, that is in our favour;

9 See Taylor on Romans, p. 32. Note.

\* Heb. vii. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Exod. xx. 5.

<sup>u</sup> Rom. ix. 13.

<sup>v</sup> Gen. ix. 25.

<sup>v</sup> P. 20.

<sup>a</sup> P. 33. and 30. note.

P This rewarding and punishing a set of men collectively, is not inconsistent with rewarding and punishing individuals separately, at the same time.—A remark is made, not unlike this, with regard to the Jews, in Bp. Green's 1st. Pamphlet about Methodists, p. 46.—But he seems to say, that individuals, who did not sufficenditions, would not share in any of the benefits which the Jews had as elect, &c. that is going rather too far: But we can scarcely dwell too much upon the different rewards (or punishments) which any one man may have; one resulting from all the various circumstances of his private conduct, as an invidual, others from the different situations in which he stands as member of different communities.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. xxii. 15. 18. - Gal. iii 6. 9. - Rom. iv. 11. 16.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This is owned by Taylor, p. 21. and fufficiently, I think, for all our purposes.

St. Paul fays, that by Adam's offence, "judgment came upon all men to condemnation,"-"many, or the many, were made finners;"—all men therefore were made liable to judgment, in some way or other. Taylor fays, they were only condemned to Death, Labour, and Sorrow; but this is faying that we do fuffer in consequence of Adam's Sin; and can our Church fay any thing more strong to shew, that the generations of men are judged collectively? and therefore, that each individual appears in this world in the light of an offender?—Still it would probably be faid, to come into the world under the fentence passed on Adam, is not to be a finner, a man can only be a finner by some choice of his own;—certainly not a proper finner, as an individual; but who fays he is? yet it feems to have been proved under the first of our propositions, that a man is more likely to have his mind in a corrupt and disorderly state for having had finful progenitors. Taylor allows, that the Jews are treated by their Lord collectively, nay that the bad conduct of Adam affects his posterity: but that is all that is needful for our purpose; that is owning, that all men are punished collectively; proper punishment is, in that case, on the race of man, on the community, not on the individual.— He fays, Adam's offence only affects our external circumstances; what punishment does more? if we may reckon forrow amongst external circumstances? -But it does not make us vicious? it makes us rank as offenders collectively, and in fact has difordered our principles, though not by a proper compulsion.—But this matter of compulsion belongs to the 10th Article d.

What

b Taylor, p. 58.

e P. 203. favoured and rejected, (as I remember) on Rom. ix. & xi. . . for Adam, see p. 205.

d See Taylor on Romans, Key, Paragraph 310.

What is called Original Sin has before been faid to contain two different ideas; our appearing in the world in the ftate of Offenders; and our having a corrupted Nature. I will offer nothing more to prove, that our coming into the world ranked as offenders makes us liable to Judgment; but I will now endeavour to shew how our having a corrupted Nature makes us fo.—But here we might premise something similar to what was premised before: as we faid, that men might be amenable to Law, and yet Law not be executed against them; fo we fay, that men, whose minds are in a diforderly state, may keep continually correcting the diforder, and continually improving their principles and dispositions, without limit. And this work may be continued through any number of In fuch a case, the desert of fuccessive ages. "wrath and damnation," would continually decrease without limit. - Of the assistance given us for this purpose, we need take no notice at present. -That a corrupted nature deferves punishment, might be left as felf-evident; for a corrupted nature means a mind, in which the inferior principles are in a flate of rebellion to their lawful superiors: But as this is all internal, it may be better to fay fomething more on the subject. Our explanation has already fled us to confult Rom. vii. 7. as a proof, that "concupifcence and lust hath, of itfelf, the nature of Sin."—But some texts are more clear than that. We may consider the tenth commandment; and some parts of the Sermon on the mount, as Matt. v. 22, about being angry; ver. 28, about g lust, and ver. 44, about love of enemies:

c Sect. 11. f Sect. xx111.

g Incesta est etiam sine stupro, quæ cupit stuprum.—quoted in Essay on Old Maids. 2. 98.

enemies; and I John iii. 15.— h These passages shew, that irregular and corrupt sentiments and passions make us guilty in the sight of God, or, at least, liable to judgment and punishment.

And reason and experience coincide with declarations of scripture. As punishment is intended to prevent wickedness, every thing requires (or deferves) punishment, which must be punished in order to prevent wickedness; this is the case with bad fentiments: and therefore we have Laws against bribery, fubornation of perjury, and feduction: exciting bad fentiments will as naturally produce bad actions, as fowing tares will produce tares: in both cases, it may be said, "an enemy hath done " this:" and in both cases, the enemy deserves restraint and punishment.—Who will fay, that Guy Faux suffered unjustly, though he he did not blow up our Parliament? or that he did not deserve King James's wrath and damnation?—Some difficulty there is, arifing from one man's ignorance of another's thoughts; fo that it is fometimes faid, that human laws do not punish sentiments, but only overt acts; yet, in some cases, it seems to me, that fentiments are really punished, though it must be in those cases, wherein overt acts prove the reality of the fentiments.

Difficulty may also be raised from the notion, that sentiments are involuntary: but they can seldom in strictness be deemed so; sometimes in their nascent state they may be involuntary, or nearly so; but even then, they may be owing to occasions, which we might have avoided, or to habits

h We might add, Matt. xv. 19.—Acts viii. 21, 22.—Ephes. iv. 22, 23.—James i. 15.

iv. 22, 23.—James i. 15.

We had occasion to make this observation, Book 111.
Chap. 111. Sect. 1.

k Matt. xiii. 28.

habits which, by proper discipline, we might have conquered.—The actions of a drunken man are involuntary, but he might have kept sober.

We conclude therefore, that concupiscence has so far "the nature of Sin," as to make us liable to

judgment 1.

Ephes. ii. 3. might here be read, as joining the two parts of original fin together: the state of

finners, and the corruption of our Nature.

If any one fays, that, though concupifcence has the nature of fin, that has no relation to *Adam*, we can only refer him to what was faid under the pre-

ceding proposition.

In fhort, though the doctrine of original fin has occasioned many difficulties, and does involve discussions of some nicety, when it comes to be argued, yet a plain case seems to take in the whole of the matter.—Suppose our King to address himself to a descendant of one of the Lords. who were beheaded in the Rebellion of 1745; he might fay, (and he might fay it with a smile of benignity)- 'You are born of a Family, which bears me no good will; and in truth I must confider You and your Family collectively; you are, from your birth therefore, a Rebel in my fight; and for being of fuch a family, you are more likely to be really disaffected; -if your parents, and afterwards yourfelf, encourage your disaffection, you will be not only a native but an actual rebel: then I must punish you as such, on having sufficient evidence. But, if your Parents bring you up by correcting your disaffection, and you acquire the principles of a good subject; You have nothing to fear

<sup>1</sup> How near Dr. John Taylor comes to our representation of the probability of men being drawn into fin by the usual propenfities of the human mind in its present state, see p. 188; or his Answer to objection 3d.

from me. Though, in strictness, you may be amenable to the Law, at least so as to lose privileges; yet, while you give me hopes of a favourable change, I shall not carry the Law into execution

against you.'

There yet remains a fourth proposition; XXXII. namely, 'Christians, after baptism, are capable of concupifcence, or mental corruption.'- This proposition rather belongs to the fifteenth Article than the present; we may however observe, that Baptism only puts us in a way to conquer our evil propenfities; we may not therefore conquer them instantaneously m. And this agrees with the language of Scripture, Gal. iii. 17.—1 Pet. ii. 11.—" What is affirmed, is fo plain, that it is only the appearance of the objection alluded to in the Article, which makes it to be expressed at all. "There is no condemnation for them, that believe and are baptizedo;" that is, they are in a flate of fafety; that fentence, under which they laid, as members of human fociety, is taken off and abolished, by virtue of Christianity P; -they may, indeed, by their ill conduct, defeat this plan, but this is the plan which is contrived for their good. The context of both Mark xvi. 16. and Rom. viii. 1, shews this to be right; they both take comprehensive and general views. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature;" then there

m See Warburton on Grace, p. 90, &c. about primitive

Christians having immediately good minds.

n And with practice. A foldier who has taken the facramentum, or military oath, has not at once the steadiness of a Veteran. The Apprentice does not make himself master of his Trade by figuing and fealing his Indentures. - Sect. xxIV. End.

<sup>·</sup> Rom. viii. 1.

P This may be the meaning of Dr. Balguy, p. 157.—This comes near Vossius's account, remanere vitiositatem, tolli reatum. -De Baptismo Disp. 6. Thesis 1. - Works, Vol. 6. p. 276.

is only one grand division, into those that believe, and those that believe not a. The Apostle too looks over the whole world at once; Jews and Gentiles are in a state of condemnation, but Christians are relieved from it; "there is no condemnation for them. Exceptions, and failures of individuals, could not be properly mentioned on so great an occasion. Human Governors, when planning enlarged schemes of policy, take the compliance of individuals for granted.

xxxIII. I will not enter into more proof of the direct kind; but we have generally found it useful to give some indirect proof; that is, to answer some objections.—The reasonings of our adversaries have been already examined in some particulars; but still it may be worth our while to select a sew objections, were it only for the purpose of illustrating and applying our more formal

proofs.

has fewer supports than might have been expected from our account of its importance.—In Scripture, Taylor says, there are but five passages, which certainly relate to it. Suppose there were no more, are five passages of scripture to be neglected? whatever they may teach? The passages from Gen. iii. and Rom. v. are of very considerable length. On what ground are they to be neglected? because, if the doctrine had been essential, it would have occurred more frequently? I do not see what right any man has to say that: or to judge how frequently God shall repeat any truth in his sacred volume.

<sup>9</sup> Being baptized is making a contract; that must imply obferving the conditions of that contract.

see Mr. Locke's last note on Chap. 7.—that is, on the verse next before the passage in question.

<sup>·</sup> On Orig. Sin, p. 5, 6, 254.

volume.-Because, if St. Paul had not been led by -a particular subject to use certain reasoning, (in Rom. v. &c.) we should never have heard of such a doctrine?—This is not to be admitted: if God had not used this method of instructing us, he might have used others: the question therefore is not, what the state of things would have been, if "these passages had never been written;" but what it is "now they are written."-Because Christ himself did not mention it in form "? but it seems agreed by all judicious \* Divines, that Christ himfelf meant to open his Religion only in part, and to leave the rest to be opened after the whole proof of his refurrection and ascension could be laid before the world, by persons to whom he gave credentials by enabling them to work miracles: fome things might more properly be opened by himself, others by his agents; shall we take upon us to determine what things were most proper to be opened by him, and what by them?—If we adopt no doctrines but those, which were delivered by Christ himself, we must cut off a number, of those, which the Church has usually thought important. —This is our answer on the supposition, that there are no more passages in Scripture to our present purpose than five: But we see, that a great many more have been of use to us: and more still might have been added.

Some valuable authors, it must be confessed, have not dwelt much on original sin. Bishop Butler, in his Analogy, seems to be brief upon it. We have not an Homily on the subject by name, though much is said to the purpose, in the Homilies

of

Gibson's 3d Pastoral Letter, p. 235.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>u</sup> Taylor, p. 6. 254.

<sup>\*</sup> See Gibson's 3d Letter, as before.

r Gibson, Ibidem, p. 235.

<sup>2</sup> Part 2. Chap. 1. p. 186, 12mo.

of the Misery of Man, and the Nativity of our Saviour.

Dr. Balguy has only two very short expressions relating to it. Probably, some candid men have been dissident about it; or, though satisfied themselves, have thought it the part of modesty and sorbearance, to desist from pressing what was esteemed dissicult, on others. And they found, that the omission of this subject did not hinder them from proceeding to others, even to such as are connected with it; the sinfulness of the world, and the communication of evil, natural and moral, from parents to children.

P. S. Bishop Warburton, in his ninth Book of the Divine Legation, has shewn no desire of evading any part of this subject.

xxxv. We will mention, as a second objection, that question, which is often urged by Taylor's: can any man be sinful except by choice? not as an individual; but, as a member of a community or collective body, he certainly may. A member of a corporation may vote against some abuses; and yet, if they are practiced, he, as a member, is guilty of them, and liable to be punished; not by evils inflicted purposely upon him; but by evils inflicted on the Corporation, and incidentally affecting

Talking the language of common life, about good fort of men, &c. fometimes feems to exclude this Theory, when it really does not: and this language is in Scripture, as well as in common writings; it is a language, which may be allowed even to those who are perfectly Orthodox, in the ordinary intercourse of men.—Saying, 'Fire is hot,' is allowable in the strictest natural Philosopher; and his using such common expression on all common occasions, does not hinder his speaking with precision when the case requires it.

b Taylor, p. 127. 190. though the former passage rather relates to the tenth Article. - Also p. 58.

fecting him.—And, in the case of corrupted nature, though no man is strictly sinful without choice, yet being born in certain circumstances will make it more difficult for him to chuse right; insomuch that, on a sooting of probability, it may be said, in the language of scripture, "it is impossible "but that he will offend. But this is only the same as saying, if a man is drawn into bad company, he will be drawn into the commission of some bad actions.

The generality of objectors to our doctrine exclaim against its cruelty: or conceive it as implying cruelty (supposing it true) in the supreme Being.—But this a groundless objection. If any men come into this world as finners, it is because God treats fome men, or all men, collectively; but to do so is, or may be, a mark of a good of Governour. If any men derive inordinate appetites from others, it is by a benevolent law, which connects different generations together. Good is hereditary, as well as evil. Indeed the law of our Nature, by which things or qualities are hereditary, has nothing to do with good and evil properly; only as qualities, which are hereditary, are good and evil; evil is hereditary accidentally, as belonging to those things or qualities, which are made hereditary by Nature. How is this then cruelty?—If you are still diffatisfied, and cannot get rid of your idea of cruelty, except your individual be spared, who has only offended as member of a community,—except he also be spared, who has offended through the impulse of irregular propensities, owing in some measure to

Taylor treats this as an absolute necessity; a notion which we have frequently contradicted and disclaimed.—Taylor on Orig. Sin, p. 58. 131. 188.

d Luke xvii. 1.

Sect. xxx. and Taylor, p. 205.

others; how do you know that, at the last judgment, they will not be spared? if it be cruel to punish them, assure yourself God will not punish them. I defy all the world to prove, that he will.

Taylor allows, that God may entail Labour and Sorrow on all men, in this world, and at last death, in consequence of Adam's offence; but nothing which can be punished as Sin: where would be the cruelty of this last, except in inslicting forrow after death? does it then lessen the cruelty, that the evil should be suffered on this side the grave? is not an evil equally an evil on both sides the grave?

Dr. Ogden's second Sermon on Christian Faith might be consulted here: particularly p. 140.

xxxvII. A

On Orig. Sin, p. 27. 101. 149.

Having, in this Section, endeavoured to enlarge our ideas of hereditary qualities; and to take the mind out of the narrow and confined track of original fin and evil, into the more open and extensive way of original qualities, of different kinds, sometimes evil and sometimes good; I think it may illustrate my idea of hereditary good, or original virtue, to reprint a Letter from the Duke of Fitzjames to Louis XVI. which appeared in the public prints in January 1791.—The community is a Regiment, the virtue is military virtue, but it is what was pursued and felt as virtue: the sentiments of loyalty, &c. are the counterpart to our Concupiscence. The "original purity" mentioned has some correspondence to our "original righteousness."—The qualities of the community are distinct from those of the individual members: yet the individuals deserve reward as members of the community.

An authentic Letter of the Duke of Fitzjames, just fent to the King of the French.

SIRE,

A faithful subject, who has not the honour of being particularly known to your Majesty, thinks it his duty, at this interesting crisis, to lay the homage of his sentiments at your Majesty's feet. These sentiments, Sire, are hereditary in his family, and he claims no other merit than that of preserving

as if it necessarily followed from our doctrine,

them in their original purity. My grandfather, a stranger in this kingdom, but of an illustrious descent, was created by your magnanimous ancestor a Peer of France; since which period both himself and his descendants have ever been distinguished for their loyalty. Of this he gave various proofs, during the course of a long and glorious life, terminated in the service of France at the siege of Philipsbourg. My father followed his example, and transmitted with his name the same sentiments to me, kis son.

In the midst of the public calamities, Sire, I am deeply affected by a consideration, peculiar to myself, which my considerate in the goodness of my King emboldens me to lay at

his feet.

My grandfather came not alone into France—His brave companions are now mine, and the dearest friends of my heart. He was accompanied by thirty thousand Irishmen, who abandoned their country, fortunes, and honours, to follow an unfortunate King. For the descendants of that respectable class of men, whom your ancestors thought worthy of protection, because they had been faithful to their Sovereign, I now entreat the fame bounty from the Great Grandson of Louis XIV. It is reported, and feems not improbable, that the National Affembly purpose disbanding the Irish regiments as foreign troops. blood they have shed in the cause of France ought to have procured them the advantage of being denizens of that kingdom, although their capitulation had not entitled them to that privilege. Permit, Sire, that I lay at your Majesty feet the ardent wish of the Irish regiments, as much attached to France by gratitude, as they formerly were to the House of Stuart by love and duty. If the Assembly of France now rejects their services, they implore your Majesty's recommendation to the Prince of your family now reigning in Spain; prefuming to affure your Majesty, that the present will be worthy of being made by a King of France, and of being favourably received by a Prince of your royal House.

Fidelity and valour are their titles of recommendation. Of the former they expect an authentic testimonial from the French nation, setting forth that they have never once departed from their duty, during the space of more than a century, that they have fought its battles, in which their valour has been uniformly conspicuous. I entreat you, Sire, to listen to their request; for myself I ask no compensation—for me there is none. The honour of commanding them is not to be repaid. It secures my glory, since to lead them against the enemy afforded a sure pledge

of speedy victory.

that Infants dying unbaptized must suffer eternal torments. Poor harmless babes! they are perfectly sheltered from all ill-treatment in the bosom of an all-kind and powerful Creator! -- can any one shew, that He is bound by the letter of any law, contrary to the spirit of it? or that he is tied up from shewing even mercy h where the case requires it?-Suppose the Theory indispensible, that Christianity alone can take off the condemnation pronounced upon our first Parent; yet, cannot God, in cases of extreme necessity, dispense with forms of admission? is it impossible that those, who have no chance of being baptized, should benefit by the Christian sacrifice? all men are mortal, all have been condemned to death through the offence of their first Parent: is it impossible, that, as the offence came on all men to condemnation, fo the free gift should come "upon all men unto justification of Life?"—But, when men will treat extreme cases as if they were ordinary, they must involve themselves in difficulties.

Laws are made for ordinary cases, and are superseded by necessity. We talk of different genera and species, as if they were perfectly distinct; but we find some intermediate things, which perplex our classing:—we talk of human beings having such and such qualities, rights, &c.—but we find some beings such, that we cannot decide whether they are human or not. Of these we can only say, as far forth as they are human beings, such and such things may be predicated of them: and this we may say of Infants; as far as they have the moral qualities of an human being, so far they seem susceptible of human rewards and punishments:

we

h Rom. ix. 15.
k See Locke 3. 6. 26. on Hum. Understanding.

we may talk abstrusely; but, in reality, there need be no more difficulty about an infant being rewarded or punished, than there is about a young Lord or Emperor, who is "mewling and puking in the Nurse's arms," and at the same time govern-

ing an extensive Monarchy.

It may, moreover, be observed, that the speculative doctrines of scripture do not seem intended for mere speculation, or to make us judges of each other; each man should take them as applicable to his own practice. If then you think the Theory of Christianity such, that infants are in danger, if not admitted into the community of Christians, baptize; but do not judge.-What I have now faid, though I think it just, seems liable to be misapplied; those who form hasty conclusions, may think, that I make the baptizing of infants a matter of too little importance: but this is not really the case; in practice, I think it indispensible, (in case of sickness); but doing our parts is a very different thing from determining what part God shall act. Nay, I not only think, that negligence may affect the Parent, but even the child: I fay, may affect; to fay, will affect, is to run into the error I am condemning; what is omitted through negligence is very different from what is omitted through necessity. As the negligence of the Parent may deprive the child of education, health, or even life itself; or occasion his having vicious principles; no man can prove, that negligence with respect to a Sacrament will not occasion material evil to the child, or deprive it of material good. I fay not, it will do fo; you must not fay,

1 Shakspeare's As You like it, Act 2. Scene 7.

I am only speaking here of those, who hold infant-baptism.

it will not ".—But this affords no argument against the Doctrine under consideration.

fin, passages are frequently quoted out of the eighteenth Chapter of the Book of Ezekiel, as expressing, that a man's goodness or wickedness is to be ascribed to himself. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." On first view, we can say, that the declarations of the prophet must be, in some way or other, reconcileable to Exod. xx. 5. otherwise both cannot come from God: therefore to argue from one of these passages, without any attention to the other, is not the way to arrive at truth.

But the case seems to be this; if any part of scripture be abused, and that abuse corrected by a subsequent writer, the correction, expressed artlessly and warmly, will sound like a contradiction. Some men seem to have abused Exod. xx. 5. as expressing the influence of one generation on another.—The end and design of visiting sins of parents on children probably is, to make parental love act as an auxiliary motive to virtue: for many men will be more careful for their offspring than for themselves:—some Jews seem to have made this plan of Providence, instead of a motive to virtue,

o This I conceive to happen, when St. James corrects the perversions of St. Paul's Doctrine about justification by Faith.—Lardner dates Paul to Romans, 58; James, 62. But this will be a subject of discussion in Art. x1.

There is fomething, I think, in Augustin very like some part of this; but I do not recollect where:—sometimes, he, and the other ancients, run too much into determining what will become of Infants.—Our church (see end of private Baptism) goes so far as to say, that Infants baptized will certainly be saved;—this is much better, I think, than any other determination of the kind. It is intended to comfort parents, and encourage Baptism.

virtue, an excuse for vice, and a pretence for evading their duty. We cannot be in the favour of God, say they; It is vain for us to be careful or good; our parents have already made us reprobates. To this evasion they seem to have added insolence; in applying a taunting proverb, "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Instead of using that Law of God, which connects generations, to affist virtue, they used it to overthrow virtue, and then laid the blame on God:—impudent hypocrify! yet they said, "the way of the Lord is not equal!" well might the prophet retort, "are not your ways unequal?"

From comparing Exod. xx. with Ezekiel xviii. it appears, that there are two Laws of God's Government; one is, 'Parents by their conduct affect their children:'-the other, 'each man must work out his own falvation:' fupposing these rules declared for men to all upon, they do not interfere with each other; the first is for the Parent, the fecond for the *child*;—and, if a man is *both* parent and child, they conspire, and affist each other, as motives to virtue; the man does what is right, for the fake of his offspring, and also for his own fake. The degree q, in which the parent affects the child, we know not precifely; but we know, that communication of good and evil from parents to children by no means renders diligence fruitless or unnecessary r.

xxxix. I

P Ezek. xvii. 25. 29. 9 Sect. xxvIII.

r Bp. Warburton gives a different account of this matter, Div. Leg. B. 5. Sect. 5.—8vo. p. 151, &c. to 160. His notions are always well defended, but I am unable to give up my own:—I have been rather at a loss with regard to Jer. xxxi. 29, 30.—Can the meaning of the Prophet be, that under the new Dispensation, men should not be guilty of such impudent hypocrify as to use the proverb about sour grapes?—The Law

xxxix. I fear, that our doctrine has been confidered, even by fome 'candid perfons, as a Theory of little utility. But who shall call a doctrine useless, which Scripture has published? which gives us the most grand and comprehensive view of God's Government, and shews us, how he treats our whole Race as one; and how he makes one generation to depend upon another?-Can that be useless, which lets us into the right way of treating ourselves? which keeps us from presumption on the one hand, and despair on the other?—Can that feem useless to a Christian (for with such we now argue), which makes us fet an high value on our Redemption by Jesus Christ?—If a child is diseased from his Birth, is it useless to be aware that he is so? or to know, that he is not incurable? And, if we can come at some knowledge of these things without having recourse to our present doctrine, yet can it ever be useless to see a subject to the bottom? I mean, as far as man is capable of feeing it? or to endeavour to hold it on the best grounds?

xL. Lastly, " I believe it is often objected to our doctrine, in one way or other, that it disgusts

men

of vifiting fins of Parents on children might continue, in some degree, though men improved so as to leave off the use of an insolent proverb.

And the Law of making Parents to affect their children, may be inforced in different degrees at different times; without limit. If the Mofaic dispensation required, that preceding generations should affect Posterity in a greater degree, than under the mere Law of Nature, yet in all ages the two Laws subsist; and therefore our solution retains its force.

8 Sect. xxxiv. latter part.

t See Girtanner on the venereal disease in children; reviewed Sep. 1790. in the Analytical Review; 8vo. 459 pages, 1788.

" I might here reply to the objection, does not Christ take away original fin wholly? how then can concupiscence remain in Christians?—but I have already mentioned this objection.—

men of philosophical minds, and makes them averse to Revelation .- But, if it has had this effect, I think the fault was in the minds of those, who were difgusted. The pride of Science has often hindered men from treating the doctrines of revelation with fufficient respect, even on their own principles; or feeing how nearly they are connected with natural Religion\*. Shall not the true philosopher enlarge his views of things? shall he not study the Laws of God's Government, giving particular attention to those, which are great and extensive? shall he not study the state and condition of human nature? and the provisions to be made against bad internal principles?-Suppose he thought, that all mankind had not two common parents; but that feveral tribes of men had each its own; yet still each tribe must trace his present qualities up to some confessed origin, in the same manner that we trace ours up to Adam. Shall Horace shew, that he had the idea of improper, fin and punishment? shall he fay, that effeminacy in the offspring is to be ascribed to vice in the parent?-Shall Cicero lament our early depravity? -Shall Plato 2 hold, that God punishes offences down to the fourth generation, - and shall the Philosopher set our doctrine at nought?

What

(Sect. xxx11.) I am inclined to mention it here, because it is properly an objection.

\* Mr. Locke himself is thought to have "fet himself to reduce the fundamental doctrines of Christianity to the narrowest compass he possibly could." (See Gibson's 3d. Past. L. p. 231):
—this is fcarcely treating the doctrines with sufficient respect, it is being asraid, and almost ashamed of them.

y See the passages, Sect. 111, Note; it might be proper to read them again before entering upon this objection.

<sup>2</sup> See Hor. Delph. Od. 3. 6. 1. Note.

What Voltaire has written on this subject is

filly and contemptible.

our Application:—or, to consider, what is the refult of the foregoing remarks, in our present circumstances.—It has been already bobserved, that it would be useful, in treating most of the Articles of our second part, to try how near an Article of Natural Religion would come to each Article of our church. Be this our first task. A right execution of this, will facilitate the rest. We must suppose our Pagan to say nothing but what is found in ancient heathen writings, or is clearly to be gathered by the light of Nature. On this ground, a

man might fay thus;

b Sect. xvI.

'We, at this time, cannot be fuch as our Creator intended when he formed us. A golden age, though feigned by Poets, shews a sense of our prefent depravity. What is the cause? Surely, in fome degree, the generations that are passed. If our forefathers had been better, so should we. But how far are we to go back, in order to find the first fource? as far back as the generations of man extend. It is not merely to bad examples, that we owe our moral disorder: in the descent of qualities from Parents to children, there is an influence much greater than that of example; whether it lie in propagation, or in education, or in both.—But, while one generation after another keeps in a state of depravity, in what light can our species stand before our Creator? only in that of a criminal. He does not regard each man merely as a separate indivi-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Voltaire's Works, quarto, Vol. 26. p. 384. I should not have left this matter so very short, though I believe I should not have detained my hearers long upon it, had I not been unable to procure the 26th Vol. of Voltaire's works at the time of giving the Lecture.

dual; (for he punishes the children for the faults of the Parents); but if he did, our depravity must incense him; and the state of our passions makes it probable, that we shall continue to offend.—What is to be done? We might agree upon some plan, some association, for meliorating our Nature:—And, though we must not expect to get all the benefit of such plan at once; though habitual desires are not to be rooted out in a moment, and purity planted in their stead, and brought to maturity; yet it is to be hoped, that God would, from the sirst, consider us and our undertaking in a favourable light.'

come to our proper business, and see in what sense a Christian may assent to our Article at this day.

—We may suppose, in some such sense as the fol-

lowing;

'Scripture treats men, confidered before Christianity has had any effect, as concluded under Sin, and children of wrath: it also describes the carnal appetites as, what we find them, too prevalent and unruly: this is true description, but unruly appetites, however truly described, must be wrong. did not create man for a state so defective: so long as we continue in it, our species must appear criminal in his eyes, and therefore so must every one that helps to compose our species. Nay, each man must be punishable fingly, so long as his passions are in a state of rebellion or anarchy; because vicious passions have the Nature of Vice. What is the cause of this evil?—the offence of our first Parents? the account of them is drawn in faint characters; yet our evil is, confessedly, in fome meafure traced up to them; and many instances appear of God's treating human Beings collectively; and experience shews, that faulty passions are transmitted mitted in a course of nature, from generation to generation.—Example cannot solve such appearances; for example is only forcible, when the models are at hand.

Our remedy for these mischiefs must lie in the Christian Religion: that, immediately on admission, restores us to a state of favour, so far as to take off the condemnation lying upon our Species; and puts each man into a way, by which he may purify the principles and passions of his mind. Only he must be aware, that mere admission into Christianity will not, of course, effect a thorough reformation in his Heart.

xLIII. The next part of our application relates to mutual concessions between contending

parties.

We, on our part, might perhaps drop the expression original sin, if that was found to be the real cause of diffension; using some harmless terms, with which no idea of dispute was associated.—We might also change any expressions, which feem to imply, that fin is a part of our nature, as reason or memory is, fixed, indelible; into fuch as shewed, that the prevalence of our carnal appetites was a thing only to be expected on a footing of probability, and always voluntary in each particular instance; and always curable. We might also change the word " damnation," into any word which would convey less terror to common minds, and would allow of all possible degrees.—We might perhaps leave more latitude for those, who doubted whether the History of Adam was to be understood literally.

On the part of our adversaries, (I speak not of Infidels, for the question is only about different interpretations of scripture amongst those, who acknowledge its authority), it might be allowed,

that

that individuals, though innocent as such, may be, agreeably to what we find in scripture, affected by what is properly the punishment of the community.

—That vicious sentiments may descend from parents to children, in a course of Nature, like insanity; and that the usual acceptation of hereditary does not pretend, in all cases, precisely to distinguish between the effects of propagation, and living together. That, when it is very probable, from experience and observation, that certain passions will prevail, it is according to custom of language and scripture, to speak of them as prevalent; though in each ast of the mind there may be choice, and though the state of the mind admits of continual amendment.

It feems to me as if those, who follow Taylor, might make these concessions; and then but little matter of dispute would remain. If any should remain, moderation in carrying it on would be here peculiarly becoming:—and it would also be practicable; because all parties allow the existence of evil, the difference is, about the manner of accounting for its existence. And this is a difference, which need not hinder men from uniting in finding and applying remedies for our mental disorders.

xLIV. We now come to the last thing, which is, as before, to consider, whether our researches have made any openings for Improvement,—The great subject of improvement here, must be hereaitary evil, natural and moral. The nature of this, and its particular Laws, should be investigated by a series of experiments. In such investigation, the remedies would be observed with a watchful eye.—

e Perhaps it may be from this part of the subject, that Augustin says, "eo (peccato originali) nihil ad predicandum notius, mhil ad intelligendum secretius."—(quoted in Encyl.)

And

And fuccess in this, would lead to an analysis of human fentiments and passions; and to the best methods of regulating them, and producing from

them their greatest good.

Improvement might be made in classing texts of scripture, which have any relation to our subject. Some texts consider the Christian in theory, others in practice; and speak of him, accordingly, as good or bad:—as free from condemnation or obnoxious to it. Sometimes man is spoken of as a species, sometimes as an individual.—Sometimes the entrance into Christianity means nothing more than mere admission; sometimes it implies all the consequences, which follow from it in the common course of things.—But we shall again have occasion to mention this classing; a great deal of dispute has arisen from the want of it.

The denunciations made on occasion of the offence of our first Parents, with regard to Labour, Agriculture, and Parturition, might afford hints for

improvements in those particulars.

Labour might be improved, or the evil of it diminished, by every one's sharing in it; with a view to health, and other ends; and by improving the condition of those, who earn a subsistence by Labour.—As also by contriving to have incitements to labour from some noble or affecting sentiment; for we know, that, in the warmth of friendship, compassion, emulation, &c. the evil of labour is entirely annihilated. Amongst these incitements should be, the hope of success; to which it would contribute greatly, if the materials were improved on which men labour.

This last thought leads us to improvement in Agriculture. The ground seems to resemble, in some

d See Essai sur les moyens de plaire, p. 178. said to be writ-

ten by Moncrieff.
Sect. xxx11.

f Gen. iii. 16. 19.

fome fort, the mind of man: if neglected, it gets over-run with weeds; but attention and experience shew the best methods of extirpating them, and preventing their growth. The present generation is too well skilled in the methods of improving agriculture, for me to offer any hints concerning

that subject.

Nor dare I hazard any particular remarks on the subject of Parturition. I think it does admit of improvement; and some cases have appeared, in which a strong sentiment, particularly that of shame, and a course of healthy activity, have greatly reduced its evils. These are hints of nature, which should be pursued: probably the "pain and peril of child-birth" would be diminished as Labour grew more pleasing. And as yet, no particular limit appears, at which the improvement must stop.

We may now draw towards a conclusion. And what thought is fo natural, after the discussion of our grand, awful, and interesting subject, as this? that the whole History of mankind feems to confift in a departure from original perfection, and a gradual return to it. We may recollect what was faid about a state of nature being a state g of war.... Supposing man to come out of the hand of his Creator fuch as he must have been intended to be, his first state would be a state of peace: but he offends, he grows corrupted, his passions grow turbulent, he falls into contentions; his state of undifciplined nature becomes a flate of war. He gets involved in fuch evils, that civil fociety becomes necessary for his fecurity: civil society brings on order and discipline, encourages industry and civilization; its benefits cause it to be enjoyed; patriotism fprings up in the mind; and the public good is pursued with ardor and affection: the result is Peace.—How like to this is the progress of the mind in its moral capacity, according to the scriptural History so much decried!—It sets out from original rightequiness, falls, becomes deprayed, suffers, is made sober; has recourse to Christianity, is regulated by Christian discipline, gets corrected, meliorated, purified: and becomes, at last, what it was originally intended to be, virtuous and happy.

Is it too visionary to hope, that the same progreffion may, at one time, be experienced in those other things, to which the first dreadful condemnation related? - Were this to be the case, Labour would become like the animated and generous exertions of the beneficent Hero, or the eager activity of the hunter, or the engaging pursuits of the man of science, and the enthusiastic virtuoso.-Agriculture, by adopting what was useful, in the field or plantation, and embellishing it with an ornamental fimplicity, would make the earth, if not a perfect Eden, a beautiful Garden, delightful to the fenses, as well as replete with falutary nourishment. - And the generations of man would be continued and perpetuated, without danger, pain, or material inconvenience to those, who never appear more amiable than in the maternal character.



## ARTICLE X.

## OF FREE-WILL.

THE condition of man, after the Fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himfelf, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

The connexion of this Article with the preceding is obvious. In the preceding, Man is described as under the influence of disorderly pasfions;—that influence must affect his choice, or Free-will, as it is called; he will not fo eafily chuse, what is right, as if he was free from that influence. This is a lamentable state, it may be faid, if we confider the confequent punishment; -true; but the present Article affirms, that God will affift man under this difficulty: by his spirit, or what has been usually called his Grace. that the present Article relates as much to Grace, as to Free-will; or perhaps more; for the remedy is more the object of this Article, than the diforder.-However, it had been customary to discuss Freedom

Freedom of Will; and the fifth Article had laid down doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit.

11. We begin, as in former Articles, with History; and we must be careful not to repeat what was given under the ninth Article, nor to mention any facts, which would be more advantageously introduced hereafter.

Let us first see whether Heathens and infidels have held any notions refembling our prefent doctrine. The ancients feem not unfrequently to refer men's good qualities to divine affiftance and Agamemnon fays to Achilles, in inspiration. Homer's Iliad,

Ει μαλα καρτερος εσσι, Θεος ων σοι τογ' εδωκεν: Fortitude is one of the four cardinal virtues. Parkhurst mentions b several instances, in which Homer uses the word everususev for inspiring the mind .-Pythagoras makes truth and virtue the gifts of God. Pindar says d, of Virtues in general, Ex @ EWV γαρ μαχαναι σασαι βροτεαις αρεταις, &c. - Socrates used to say, were - on maineir rois and comois week two ανθρωπειών ωαντων .- Erasmus speaks of Cicero as inspired; and, in modern times, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, a famous Deist, addresses God as "giver of all inward illuminations 8."—These seem to be instances of referring moral qualities to God:natural events are frequently referred, as the finding of Polycrates's ring, to Neptune; but I will only

<sup>2</sup> Iliad, 1. 178.

b Hebr. Lexicon under 777 - sense vii.

See his Life by Ladvocat; -also by Dacier, Vol. 2. p 219.

d Pyth. 1. 79. or seeφη γ: see also some of his Commentors. The ancient idea of Virtue was extensive; see Hume's Essays, Vol. 2. p. 282.

See Oliver's Tufc. disp. beginning.

<sup>8</sup> See Leland's View, Vol. 1. p. 24. 4th Edit.

h Valer. Max. 6. 9. quoted by Pearson on Creed, p. 444. 1ft. Edit. or 218. fol.

recall to your minds the prayer of the Countryman to Hercules, as that is an instance of uniting divine assistance with human' endeavoursk.

111. The fews feem to have been more in the habit of referring things to God, than any other people: they spoke of him, not only as the cause of good, but of evil. One reason probably was, that they were more immediately under the Government of God than any other people. When the more extraordinary communications between God and them ceased, they had the Prophets to connect them with him; and, when Prophecy at length was filent, they still remained a distinguished people.—I imagine no other people would speak of God's hardening the Heart of an oppressive Prince, or of leading men into Temptation1. Yet they had not all exactly the same idea of the divine agency, when opposed to human. The Essenes are m said to have favoured divine agency, the Sadducees human; and the Pharisees, to have been in a kind of middle opinion.—The Pfalms contain some prayers

Fable of the Countryman and Hercules.

These instances do not express the Slavery or captivity of the will; nor distinguish between preventing and assisting Grace: niceties are not to be expected: yet, in Dacier's account of the doctrine of Plato, (French Edit. p. 153,) there is a something about blindness of the mind: and vicious actions becoming involuntary, which seems really to bear some affinity to the Christian (or Jewish) expressions. Men are drawn on, (Dacier says, representing the doctrine of Plato,) "par le mal heureux penchant de leur cœur, qui leur sait commettre le mal qu'ils ne voudroient pas saire; ils sont esclaves du peché, qui les domine, et au service duquel ils ont engagé leur liberté."—But I have not an opportunity at present of giving the passages in the Original.

Introd. to Part. 11. Sect. xv1.

m Burnet on the 17th Art.—Rogers on the 10th Art. mentions both Sadducees and Pharifees, as holding Free-will, "and that unto the best things."

prayers for moral qualities. Maimonides says, that every man has it in his power to turn himself into a good way, and to be just, pick, righteous. And this he proves from Gen. iii. 12, which is consequent to the Fall.—His expression is general; but it seems to be opposed, in his mind, to decrees, rather than to mental corruption, or slavery of the will.—Isaiah xi. 2, 3.—and lxi. 1. may be reckoned out of the ordinary course of things.—Prov. xvi. 1. 9.

observations may be made here, which were made under the preceding Article?:—including that on the Manicheans: if any one doubts whether any passages can be found in the early writers, which are to our purpose, I need only refer him to Vossius's Historia Pelagiana, and Nicholls on this 10th Article.—Nicholls has collected some passages, with regard to the Slavery of the will, others concerning preventing, others concerning assisting Grace.—Baxter also tells us, that both Greek and Latin Fathers, who wrote before the days of Augustin, deny any such Grace as, by an insuperable operation, shall infallibly convert.

v. We now proceed to the fifth century: and here we again get into the Pelagian controversy. The history of Pelagius has been given before; and a charge of inconsistency against Augustin has been mentioned, which belonged, as to the subject of it, to this place; though, as affecting his character.

n Pfalm li. 10, 11.—and cxix. passim.

O De pænitentia, cap. 5. Edit. Clavering, Oxon. 1705.

P Art. 1x. Sect. v.

<sup>9</sup> P. 644. 6. with regard to Grace in general.—but with regard to preventing Grace, see B. 4. Chap. 2.

On Perseverance, p. 3.

Art. 1x Sect. v1. t Art. 1x. Sect. v11.

character, more properly to the former. present subject seems to have been the principal one of the Pelagian controversy; the others were rather secondary objects; but it admits of so many niceties, that to give the hiftory of that controverfy with precision, should be a separate work.— Vossius has been very attentive in giving it, and a student, who is defirous of fearthing into this matter, can fearcely, I should imagine, read a better work ". Forbes may also deserve mention.—The general idea of the doctrine of the Pelagians, with regard to our present subject, is, that they wanted to reduce all the fayings of Scripture concerning the divine affiftance in things moral and spiritual, or concerning the divine influence on the mind, to external helps; fuch as the publication of the gofpel, the promife of eternal rewards and punishments, &c. these were allowed by all to influence the mind; but the orthodox understood the scriptures to declare an immediate action of the Deity on the mind of man.—The Pelagians contrived feveral expressions, which had very much the appearance at first of delivering the orthodox doctrines; but, on an accurate examination, they were found to be ambiguous: fuch is that strong one mentioned by Dr. Fortinx, God "affifts us," " by illuminating us with divers and ineffable gifts of his heavenly Grace:" this many orthodox would be ready to take in their own fense; but it is capable of being construed so as to fignify only external information:—and other parts of the Pelagian writings required fuch construction, in order to avoid inconfistency.—We have before produced

\* Dissertation 2d. p. 51.-Wall, p. 169.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> P. S. I am glad to fee fo good a character of this work as there is at the end of Plaifere's Appello, given by Dr. Chr. Potter, p. 423.

the Creed of Pelagius, as delivered to Innocent the first. We find these words in it, with relation to our present subject, "Liberum sic consitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus nos Dei semper indigere auxilio." Augustin shews , the ambiguity of auxlio, which indeed may mean external help; and was probably intended to convey that idea to the Pelagians.-What the Orthodox doctrine was, we may see from the Letter of the African Bishops to Pope Zosimus, who seems to have taken the Pelagians in the fense they wished, and therefore to have been defirous of favouring them. These prelates require, that Pelagius and Cælestius "do by a plain confession own, that we are in every action affifted by the Grace of God, not only to understand, but also to practise righteousness; in fuch wife, as that, without it, we are not able to do, to speak, to think; or to have anything of true and fincere piety 2".- It might be added to this account, that the Pelagians feem to have carried on their idea of imitation; as original fin was an imitation of Adam, fo the grace of Christ confifted in part in his fetting us a good example: It should also be mentioned, that the Pelagians talked much of the grace of Christ illuminating the human understanding b; not perhaps internally c, as fome moderns do, and immediately. - Jerom's Letter to Ctefiphon may lastly be mentioned, as **fhewing** 

y De Gratiâ Christi, C. 33. Vol. 10. Edit. Benedict. - (See

Wall, Chap. 19. Sect. 29.)

Vossius ibidem .- Wall, p. 171, or C. 19. Sect. 15.

See Ludlam's Essay on the Spirit.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Prosper contra Collatorem. C. 10. this translation is in Wall, C. 19. Sect. 15.—Prosper's was a famous work against Cassian, in defence of Augustin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> See Vossius Hist. Pel. p. 654, or Lib. 3. par. 2. Antith. 3. from Aug. adv. secundam Juliani—Responsionem, Lib. 11. Cap. 145. (should be 146). p. 753. Edit. Ben.

shewing the manner, in which the Pelagians argued against divine grace; they used a kind of reduction ad absurdum, by asking, whether, if we wanted to do the most vulgar or unclean actions, (specifying them) we need require the divine affistance 4.

vi. Though I have not read regularly all Augustin's writings relating to the Pelagian controverly, yet from what I have feen, I retain my partiality for him as an acute and noble writer; especially, Allowing, that controverly the times confidered. warmed him into faying some things too strong in favour of divine agency, as interfering with human, (though I should doubt whether it really did, notwithstanding I have seen some things, which at first appeared strong) yet one would think nothing very bad could come from one, who uses the following expressions : " si non est Dei Gratia, quomodo falvat mundum? fi non est liberum arbitrium, quomodo judicat mundum?—Quia ista questio, ubi de arbitrio voluntatis et Dei Gratia disputatur, ita est ad discernendum difficilis, ut quando defenditur

d See Wall, Ch. 19. Sect. 20.

of opinion in Augustin consisted in this: (De Pred. Sanct. Cap. 3.) He once thought, we had something so much our own, that we need not ascribe it to God; but he was struck with 1 Cor. iv. 7. and he sound other passages, in which even Faith was ascribed to God; as 1 Cor. vii. 25. therefore he determined to ascribe Faith to God:—his former opinion, he says, was right, as far as it went; he had before ascribed Virtue (or Benevolence its chief source) to God; now he ascribes both Faith and Virtue. They are both our own, he says, " propter arbitrium voluntatis," yet both may be called the Gifts of God. "Love with Faith." Eph. vi. 23.

I see no fault but taking the sentimental expressions of Scripture in too strict and speculative a way. But one side did that as much as the other. Here is no scheme to set aside free-will: there is rather the contrary in the writings of Augustin to the monks at Adrumetum.

Vossius Hist. Pel. ad init. from Aug. Ep. 46. ad Valentinum. printed Edit. Ben. in 10th Vol. p. 470.

hiberum arbitrium, negari Dei Gratia videatur; quando autem asseritur Dei Gratia, liberum arbitrium putetur auserriz". Since this is the case, he says, only let Pelagius express himself in terms, which are not ambiguous, and all controversy will cease.

This is not the language of a Bigot!—Quod si forte latenter sentit, ignoscat aliter suspicantibus; ipse enim hoc facit, &c.—it is Pelagius's own fault if we suspect him, he might so easily speak out: this surely is liberal, as well as acute. In his book de Civitate Dei, Augustin speaks in savour of Freewill, on principles of natural Religion; just as any

Philosopher would speak.

VII. Augustin died in the year 430; Fulgentius, who was also an African Bishop, and lived to the year 533, may be considered as a successor to Augustin, in taking the lead as far as related to defending the orthodox doctrines. Indeed the Bishops in other parts of the world, both in Europe and Asia, seem to have had that diffidence with regard to the doctrine or expressions of Augustin, and to have felt that shock, which some good men in other parts have felt in most ages. This occasioned the sending of Petrus Diaconus from the East, at the head of a deputation, to confer with the Africans. It also was the occasion of some debates, into which a countryman of our wown entered; his name was Faustus, and he was distinguished from others of that name by the Title of Riensis, or Regensis, from the Bishopric of Riez in France, which he held .- Fulgentius lived much under persecution, as the Arian party were in power in his time:—he wrote to Thrasimund

Vol. 7. Edit. Ben. - Lib. 5. cap. 10.

<sup>8</sup> Aug. de Gratia Christi, cap. 47. or Sect. 52. p. 168.

h Aug. de Natura et Gratia, Cap. 59, or Sect. 69. p. 105.

Cave fays, natione Gallus, only of a British Family.

with great and unaffected dignity, at the time when he was under a fentence of banishment, passed by the authority of Thrasimund himself:

—he wrote in a stile so manly and so rational, as nothing but a strong conviction and a fixed sense

of duty could dictate.

v111. We have already given a general idea of the Semipelagians. Their opinion with regard to our present subject, is most briefly expressed thus; they allowed an affifting or co-operating grace, but denied a preventing grace: this is faid, but there are some distinctions, which might be made, if it were our particular business to get a very precise idea of their notions: as that they allowed a grace preventing, or previously inspiring, good works", but not dictating Faith, or good will. They did not allow, that grace was given exactly according to men's deserts; yet they thought a good character was an occasion of giving it; or rather of offering it; for they thought, that every man was free to accept or reject the divine affiftance.—The person mentioned as the leader of the Semi-pelagians, is John Cashan, who is placed in the year 424, fix years before Augustin's death.— Cassian founded two Monasteries near Marseilles, and therefore the Semi-pelagians are frequently called Massilienses .- The chief person who opposed Cassian, was Prosper, who is placed in the year 434: he followed Augustin, and his works are fometimes made an appendix to the works of that Notwithstanding his efforts, the Semipelagians gained ground in the fixth Century; and have never been extinct: they feem likely to continue,

Mosheim. Index.

<sup>1</sup> Art. 1x. Sect. 1x.

m See Vossius, Lib. 4. par. 1. p. 683.—Aug. De Predest. fanctorum, with the Letters of Prosper and Hilary prefixed, Ed. Ben. Vol. 10.

continue, and to be popular; as they neither offend by depreciating scripture, nor by neglecting reason. The English Divines have been supposed to favour their tenets, though the Liturgy of our church implies, in several places, that we

hold the doctrine of preventing Grace.

1x. The disputes about Grace, which began in the fifth Century, have never wholly subsided; they have grown more and more intricate, and therefore more voluminous. Calmet says, that more has been written by Divines upon Grace than upon any other subject. Voltaire seems to account for it by saying, "cette question, ainsi que presque toute la metaphysique, rentre pour le fond dans le labyrinthe de la fatalité et de la liberté, où toute l'antiquité s'est égarée, et où l'homme n'a guères de fil qui le conduise."—This being the case, we must content ourselves with se-lecting a sew remarkable æras.

The Mohammedans feem to attribute a great deal to the divine affiftance; nay, so much as to take away even human co-operation. See Calmet's Dic-

tionary under Grace.

In the ninth century, our doctrine, and those connected with it, occasioned disturbance. Gotescale, or Godeschalchus, studied the works of Augustin with great ardour, and filled his mind with losty conceptions of the divine Grace and decrees; some of them such as Augustin had really never entertained, as they ran into the extremes of absolute reprobation. He was a German by birth, but belonged to a monastery in France, near Soissons; there is a Bishop of Soissons, but he is under the Archbishop of Reims.—This zealous monk took a

P Dict. under Grace.

<sup>·</sup> See Nicholls on this tenth Article.

Siécle de Louis xiv. du fansénisme; near beginning.

journey to Rome, in order to visit the Tombs of the Apostles: on his return, he visited the Bishop of *Verona*, and poured forth to him the sublime notions, which he had been imbibing; the Bishop heard so much of

"Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute," that he began to be alarmed and terrified: he thought the matter required advice; he accordingly applied to Raban Archbishop of Mentz, to whom Gotescale was as ready to open himself, though in a Synod, as he had been to the Bishop of Verona. Raban caught the alarm, and accused this admirer of Augustin to his highest superior, the Archbishop of Reims; the hot, imperious Hincmar. Hincmar called a provincial Council, had the monk condemned, degraded, imprisoned, beat with rods; nay, what might be worst of all, compelled to burn his own writings with his own He died in prison, and after the facraments had been refused to him when alive, burial was refused to his body.—On this occasion, the flames of controversy about Grace (and the doctrines allied to it) broke out afresh. And the affair of Gotescale has seemed of such consequence in later days, that eminent men have written upon it; Vossius and Archbishop Usher particularly: Usher was a strong predestinarian, and published a little volume about Gotescalc expressly. Vossius has made the transactions here imperfectly mentioned, the subject of the last part of his Pelagian History.

x. The Schoolmen, in the twelfth century, seized on every question in the subtle controversies about Grace, and separated it into its minutest fibres: which they moreover twisted with the fine threads

of

Paradife Loft.

About the year 868.—He was imprisoned in his Monastery.

of the Aristotelian Philosophy. We shall have occasion to speak of the Schoolmen under the thirteenth Article; we will only mention some here as the leaders of Sects. Thomas Aquinas, of the illustrious Family of the Counts of Aquino (Juvenal's birth-place) followed the notions of Augustin. He is often called St. Thomas; his Summa Theologia, or body of Divinity, is praifed by the authors of the French Encyclopédie, as a great effort of human intellect. But what I mean now to fay of him is only, that from him his followers had the name of Thomists; they were opposed to the Scotists. whose head was John Duns Scotus an Englishman, (or Irishman according to Cave): probably his name was John' Duns; Scotus, as before observed. was in old times, the Latin word " for Irishman; which might not be diffinguished from English-In the age we are speaking of, the Dominicaus and Franciscans had all the learning of the times between them. The Dominicans were Thomists; and Scotus (or John Duns) being of the Franciscan order, the Franciscans were Scotists.— Any one, who wished to take a slight view of the subtleties of the Schoolmen, with regard to the doctrine of Grace, might read part of the index to Thomas Aquinas's Summa. There are in it about nine columns of the word Gratia.—Or he might read the disputes of the Dominicans and Franciscans at the Council of Trent\*. The greatest intricacies feem to be about the beginnings of Grace. with acts of the will: I think it was faid, that God waited for the volition when a man was previoufly

See Ladvocat .- Sir John Duntze is an English Baronet.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Handel was called il Saffone: - So Paul Veronese, Claude Lorrain, &c.

<sup>\*</sup> Heylin's Hist. Quinqu. Part 1.—Chap. 3. Sect. 4, &c.—Paolo's History.

ously prepared by Grace; that is, in the language of the Schools, when the man was "constitutus in actu primo sufficiente ad bene operandum."—It will not be forgotten, I hope, that I am here speaking historically, and not explaining or rea-

foning.

We will now proceed to the age of the XI. Reformation. The Reformers in general, from Wickliffe down to Luther and Calvin, were much inclined to high notions of the divine agency; or, as they thought, to be followers of Augustin.—Severity of manners, and great seriousness about the Majesty and Glory of God, might promote this The doctrines debated on as Lutheran in the Council of Trent are very strong indeed.—But the Church of England meant to be much more moderate; as appears from the Necessary doctrine; and as is well described by Glocester 2 Ridley in his Life of Bishop Ridley. - Nothing indeed can better shew the intention of our church than one short tentence at the end of the Article of Free will in the Necessary Doctrinea; "All men be also to be monished, and chiefly preachers, that in this highe matier, they lokyng on both fides, fo attempre and moderate themselves, that neyther they so preache the grace of God, that they take away thereby freewill, nor on the other fide fo extoll freewill that injury be done to the Grace of God."—I do not think there was ever anything faid more fenfibly on this subject. - The reformatio legum has these words, "Et fimiliter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt

Z Book v. Chap. vii.

y See Heylin Quinqu. Part 1. Chap. 3. Sect. 1.

a Our church afterwards got nearer Calvinism.

b It is like Augustin's, Si non est Dei Gratia, &c. Sect. vz.

ponunt, ut eo folo fine alià speciali gratià, rectè ab

hominibus vivi posse, constituunt "."

We have no Homily professedly on this subject; fome few expressions are to be met with in the first part of the Homily on Salvation, but nothing in the way of theory, or speculation, or definition .-Room feems left by our church for persons of different perswasions; the doctrine is left as unintelligible; both Free-will and Grace being established, without any authoritative folution of the difficulty arifing from their feeming inconfiftency.-I fuppose any of *Plaifere's* five opinions might be professed in our church.

We have before fpoken of Antinomians, XII. under the feventh Article. All we need fay of them here is, that they held Grace to be irrefiftible: which tenet would imply, that all human endeavours are unnecessary. Some who held tenets of this nature were called Gospellers; but Antinomians were of all countries. These Antinomians opposed

the Anabaptists, who revived Pelagianism.

The order of Jesuits was founded in Bower faysh, that they followed the Semi-1540. pelagians; they have been enemies to the high orthodox doctrines of Grace, &c .- So indeed have been other scientifical men.—There is a short history of them, faid to have been written by D'Alembert, which feems well worth reading; though I should not think the author a Friend to Revelation'. He confiders the Society as only using

Religion

De Hæresibus, Cap. 7. d Art. v 11. Sect. 111.

Dr. Jortin's 2d. Diff. p. 96. from Burnet. f At first, extolling Gospel by setting aside Law; afterwards by heightening Gospel in any way.

g Life of Ridley, p. 344.

h Vol. 1. p. 350.—Lives of Popes.

Printed 1765. (no place).

Religion as a means of getting Power; yet he considers Le Tellier (p. 107,) as fincere about doctrine.

The Jesuits might be, properly, religious at first, and when they found the effect of religion in acquiring power, might apply it to that purpose: this, I imagine, has been often done: they must take up some doctrine about Grace, &c. and they took up that, which would succeed best, in courts particularly. Either extreme, of the Pelagians or their adversaries, would have impeded their progress in the world: and thinking men would adopt prudential views most easily where they found they had no clear ideas.

The doctrine of the Romanists may be feen in the fixth Session of the Council of Trent; in the first five Canons concerning Justification.—

I do not see, that our Article is incompatible with them.

The Romanists have been, since the Reformation, perplexed to determine what part they should take in controversies concerning Grace, &c.—They have extolled Augustin so highly, as to think they must be for him; and they must be against the Reformers: yet the Reformers were great admirers of Augustin; and the Jesuits, devoted to Rome, inclined to Semipelagianism. This, and the divisions amongst themselves, have been the occasion of many inconsistencies, and of many refined strokes of papal policy. What we say of such transactions shall be arranged under heads of different countries, rather than in the order of time.

xiv. Spain has produced Molinak, or Molinos: he was a Jesuit, and a kind of leader in reconciling

E Distinguish between this Lewis Molina, or Molinos, and Michael Molinos, a Quietist.

Voltaire meckons him the original author of the distinctions used in the controversies of the last Century; but some persons ascribe their origin to the Schoolmen.—Disputes have arisen on this question, into which it does not seem necessary for us to enter.—Molina has been of consequence enough to have his book called the precursor of Antichrist, and to be appealed against at Rome.

xv. Holland and Flanders have not only produced the famous Michael Bay, a divine of Louvain, whose doctrines were condemned at Rome, and afterwards brought forward, in order to throw odium on a rival party; but they have been the scene of warm contests with regard to the agency of God, as opposed to the the agency of man.—Those who had high notions of the Divine agency in the salvation of Mankind, were called Gomarists, from one Gomar born at Bruges. Their opponents were called Arminians, from Jacob van Harmine, in Latin Arminius, born at Oude-water in 1560.

The Arminians got the name of Remonstrants, from remonstrating against the treatment they met with; and on that account, the Gomarists came to be called Contra-remonstrants: they are now most commonly called Calvinists, from Calvin, who, though a Frenchman, was principally settled at Geneva. The samous Grotius, or de Groot, was an Arminian; he was born at Delst; his great eminence

<sup>1</sup> See a short account of his Book in Dupin's Compendious History, Cent. 17. Chap. 1.

m Jansénisme; Louis x I v.
n See Vitringa's Theology, Vol. I. where he speaks de media scientia, under de Attributis Dei; (Sapientia).

Voltaire, ib. P Dupin, ib.

<sup>9</sup> Ladvocat.

VOL. III.

eminence in Learning did not prevent his suffering for his opinions. In 1618, it was thought proper to hold a fynod at Dort (or Dordrecht) on account of the contentions between the two parties now mentioned. It fate from Nov. 1, 1618, to April 26, 1619: Politics got mixed with Religion: the Arminians were overpowered, Prince Maurice exerting himself against them; and their great support, the Pensionary Barnevelt, was beheaded, under pretence of Treason, within a month after the Council broke up. Grotius was imprisoned foon afterwards, but escaped out of prison, and became an eminent statesman in Sweden, and an Ambassador; nay, at last he received honours in his own Country. Arminius ended his life in a less fortunate manner; he was cited to the Hague, where he defended his opinions; but he was so harassed by the intrigues of the opposite party, that he died at the age of 49: this indeed was before the Synod of Dort; but after it, his followers were obliged to fly their country.—Amongst his followers have been many learned men: Episcopius, Limborch, Le Clerc; and others might be mentioned:

It may be as proper here', as anywhere, to mention, that the points in dispute between Calvinists and Arminians are reduced to five; frequently called the five Articles, or the five Points. Heylin has written an History of them, which he calls his Historia Quinquarticularis; a very respectable work. — The first is Predestination; the second is the extent of redemption; the third, the flate of the human will before conversion to Christianity; or what helps it requires to enable it to do right: the fourth, the nature of the divine

ashstance

r "The quinquarticular" Controversy "is generally supposed to have acquired that name much about the time of holding the Synod at Dort." Tucker to Kippis, p. 69.

affistance in and after conversion: and the fifth is Perseverance. These subjects constitute what we have called the second part of our 39 Articles (admitting a fort of digression about works of supererogation), and they all come into the canons of the sixth Session of the Council of Trent under the head of fustification. We may here read a few expressions, shewing different notions of our present subject; either in Heylin, Mosheim, or in Plaisere's Apello Evangelium:—We may read also a short passage in Wall on infant-baptism, 4to. p. 168.

XVI. Germany produced both Luther and Melancthon, great and able men; of very different tempers indeed; Luther bold and fevere; Melancthon mild and amiable; but both greatly instrumental in promoting the Reformation. They lie buried near each other at Wittemberg, where they had both taught Divinity. The worst of Luther's opinions have just now been mentioned"; but, by correcting the errors of Agricola, he moderated his own; and it is thought, that the moderate Lutherans in general are, in the Doctrines we are now speaking of, very near the tenet of the Council of Trent. The notions of MelanEthon, on our present subject, are well represented in Heylin's quinquarticular History, from the Augustan confession, which

In the English Articles of 1552, there is one Article De libero Arbitrio, another De Gratia: in those of 1562, there is only one of these; retaining the title of the first, De libero Arbitrio.—In Heylin's account of the sive Articles, according to the Doctrine of the Church of England, he puts the second and third as being both contained in our present Article, the tenth.—Dean Tucker calls the five Points "Predestination, Redemption, Grace, Justification, and Perseverance." Letters to Dr. Kippis, p. 69.—Whitby wrote a book on the five Points.

Vol. 2. p. 521, quarto, or Vol. 5. p. 444, octavo.

Plaifere, p. 28.

<sup>\*</sup> Sect. x1. y Art. v11. Sect. 111.

which was compiled by Melancthon chiefly:
though Luther is faid to have been concerned in
it.—But for an account of this Confession I will
refer to Dr. Robertson's History of Charles V. as
to a work which will be acceptable: Charles V.

confirmed the Augustan Confession in 1555.

XVII. In France, the Doctrines of Free-will and Grace, (and the others with which they are connected) occasioned the memorable disputes between the Jesuits and the Jansenists. Cornelius Jansen was born in Holland, but was afterwards Bishop of Tyres in Flanders. He was a great admirer of Augustin, and wrote accounts of his works, which made a Folio Volume; the Book was called Augustinus; and was published after his death, though left prepared: it is in our libraries. He died in 1638, but a friend of his, the Abbé of St. Cyran, spread the doctrines contained in it; in confequence of fome directions in his Will. gave great offence to the Jesuits, who made interest with the Pope to have it condemned as a fequel to the Book of *Baius*, which had been condemned before. The court of Rome was perplexed; however they condemned five propositions, and ordered all the Clergy to fign a condemnation of them. Voltaire gives the conclusion of the Form; " Je condanne, de cœur et de bouche, la doctrine des cinq propositions contenues dans le livre de Cornelius Jansenius, laquelle doctrine n'est point celle de Saint-Augustin, que Janfenius a mal expliquée." Now the five propositions, though collected out of Jansen's Book, were not expressed in his words; nor were any places referred to, from whence they were taken. So that it may be doubted, 1st. Whether the five propositions were really in Jansen's book;—and 2ly. Whether Janfen's notions were really in Augustin's works.— Here

Introduction to Book Iv. Sect. Iv.

Here was a fine field for dispute I and the zeal, numbers, rank, abilities, of the partizans, carried dispute to an enormous length. Miracles were performed on both fides: those of the Jansenists are introduced into Mr. Hume's essay on Miracles.—When the dispute becomes, instead of a comparison of doctrines, a trial of strength of parties, it ceases to be our concern. I had once occasion to mention some of the consequences of the dispute; the rest may be found in Voltaire, and the book about Jesuits lately mentioned.—The sive propositions are in Mosheim's ecclesiastical History; and even in Dupin's compendium.—Dr. Powell mentions the subject in his Charge on Controversy.

xvIII. As we are going on according to Countries, we may take the Socinians, as what they call themselves, Fratres Poloni. The Racovian Catechism will sufficiently shew us their opinions .-There is in it a chapter de libero arbitrio, from whence it appears, that they hold as follows; free-will was not taken away from Adam, (fuch deprivation was not mentioned as a part of his punishment) nor from us, by his offence: Man is weak, but a will remains, and he can do the will of God, "divino auxilio accedente;" and God refuses help to no man. Help is external, or internal; the latter is when "Deus in cordibus eorum qui ipsi obediunt, quod promisit, obsignat." The drawing, mentioned John vi. 44. is by the excellence of God's promises .- It is true, that some men are incorrigible, in particular instances; God rejecting them from his Grace. There is also a chapter on the promise of

<sup>\*</sup> B. 111. Ch. x.

Vol. 2. p. 397, quarto.—Vol. 5. p. 213, octavo.

P. 299.

the Holy Spirit, in which the fealing on the heart is also mentioned, as that by which we acquire an hope sufficiently strong to make us impregnable to temptations; but it is affirmed, that the gift of the Holy Spirit is not previously necessary to our believing the Gospel, because none have that gift ex-

cept fuch as do already believe.

Dr. Priestley f speaks as if what is said of men in common discourse, that they can do all that God requires of them, was to exclude the more strict System of Christianity; as if St. Paul, in reasoning from what would be allowed by Gentiles, faid all he would ever wish to fay.—He allows a "moral impotence" to receive " the doctrines of Revelation," owing to " fenfual dispositions" indulged, and " habits" contracted: which is feemingly all that one of our church need own: we conceive fuch habits to be partly what may be called hereditary; but that is a matter belonging to the ninth Article.-He confiders the affiftance given by God as confifting in instructions and motives; or as being externals:though he allows of divine influence "on certain occasions," given to men duly disposed; so as to be "the proper subjects of such extraordinary Every one must perceive a likeness between Dr. Priestley's notion of Grace, and that of the Pelagians.

Dr. John Taylor has made a collection of texts, in order to shew the different senses of the word xages. Pelagius reckoned up a number of senses, in which he allowed of divine Grace: or a number were reckoned up for him. Taylor makes ten

fenses

Familiar Illustration, p. 1. 4. 5. 10. 11.

Though the motive impells the Will, it is to be confidered as external: the choice is made in a manner purely human, as any other choice is made, in worldly concerns.

h At the end of his Book on Original Sin.

Wall, p. 169.

fenses of xagis, and concludes, that it does never "particularly, and only signify, the instuence of the spirit of God upon the heart, disposing us to believe in Christ, and to practice Virtue." But it may possibly be included with "other blessings in the general notion of the savour, or Grace of God."—This collection of texts is a posshumous work, and relates only to one word, xagis.—In his paraphrase on Rom. viii. 27, Taylor says, that the Holy Spirit inspires good dispositions.—Writers use the word Grace as a technical term established by

custom; and as such we adopt it.

We have now brought our History down to the present time; but we have not thought it worth while to mention all particulars; we have rather aimed at giving right general ideas than many particular ones; and have therefore dealt, as it were, by famples or specimens. I might here mention the distinction between common and special grace, as Taylor thinks it worth while to prove that fuch distinction is not founded in scripture; and it is mentioned by Voltaire. Common, or sufficient Grace seems to be such as may enable men to become Christians, if they do all in their power to become fo. It feems supposed, that this grace might have its effect, but, through the weakness and vicious habits of men, it has not.— Special grace fupplies this defect; or is fo ftrong, that it not only might succeed, but does succeed: this is also called efficacious Grace:—A curious jumble of cause and effect! Voltaire says, "ils foûtenaient

1 Candide.—Louis x 1v. Jansénisme.

k Orig. Sin, p. 249, 252.

m Plaifere, p. 22.—I should think, that the jest about Dr. Swift's degree, being given speciali gratia, was an allusion to this technical expression of Theology; as well as to University Graces.—I see it is speciali gratia in the Reform. Legum.

foûtenaient une grace suffisante à laquelle la volonté peut consentir et ne consent jamais; une grace efficace à laquelle on peut resister et à laquelle on ne

résiste pas "."

As Free-will is opposed to necessity, it may be proper to mention, that very worthy and sensible men have favoured the hypothesis of necessity; as Dr. Hartley and Jonathan Edwards; I suppose sew men have exceeded these two in understanding, information, and Christian Piety.—Mr. Hume is not to be reckoned amongst the Friends of Christianity, but his essay on Liberty and Necessity contains things, which seem reasonable. His ideas seem, in some respects, like my own; how far I may have formerly borrowed my thoughts from his, I cannot tell.

Amongst those, who own internal influence on the mind, there are, (or have been) some who hold, that such internal influence is immediately discernible;—others who say, that it is only mediately perceivable; that is, by means of virtuous disposition and conduct. The former sort are, by the latter, accounted enthusiass: and perhaps they may not allow such doctrine in the way of profession of Faith, or definition, though they are

generally supposed to hold it.

xx. I have referved for a separate mention those, who have expressly and openly held, that God immediately causes the finful state of some men's minds, by withdrawing his Grace from them.— Something indeed to this purpose has been produced out of the Racovian Catechism, because the whole of what we wanted to take from it, came most commodiously together; though, by the way, I cannot at present reconcile God's refusing Grace to no man, and his leaving some men incorrigible,

incorrigible, by rejecting them from his Grace.-There are, to be fure, in scripture, many expresfions about blinding men, hardening, giving them up to a reprobate mind, not renewing them, &c.; now, when these expressions are made into Theories, they produce fuch hypotheses as those we are now speaking of .- In the fixth Canon of the fixth Seffion of the Council of Trent, those Christians are condemned who fay, "mala opera ita, ut bona, Deum operari; non permissivè solum, sed propriè et per se; that this is meant of human actions, appears by what follows; "adeò ut fit proprium ejus opus non minus proditio Judæ, quam vocatio Pauli."-Some ancients are referred to in the margin; but we must not be too particular. It appears from Irenaus, that he was obliged to oppose one Florinus for holding, that God was the author of Sin. This might be conceived to happen either by decree or influence; the latter only is our present concern.—Heylin a says, that, after the time of Irenæus, the doctrine was not held till the fixteenth century, and then only by an illiterate fet of men called Libertini', whom all parties disclaimed. Calvin gives us their notion in a few words; "Quicquid ego et tu facimus, Deus efficit; nam in nobis est."-In the Synod of Dort, one Macorius is mentioned as holding a doctrine near this .- And the Manichean doctrine feems the same in effect. - Jansen thought, that Augustin

Martin Luther, in his Table-talk, expresses himself thus;
"When the Deity intends to destroy kingdoms and states, he taketh from them their wisslom, he leaveth them no wise and honest counsellors; that is, he blinds them, and afterwards he bereaveth them of their power and ability; they go on in blindness and security, and at last perish."

P Heylin Quinq. 1. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Heylin, ibidem; where are Calvin's words here quoted.

Antinomians.

<sup>4</sup> Heylin quinqu. p. 529. 533.

Augustin held the impossibility of virtue in some men: not only in the blinded and hardened, but in the saithful and just; grace failing: St. Peter was an instance.

that it is credible the contending parties might each have a good meaning; some being afraid of depreciating "Scripture, others fearing to do violence to right reason, or destroy the soundation of all Virtue; or encourage folly and superstition and enthusiasm. The truth is, (though no one party perhaps had a full right to say so,) reason must rejoice in the genuine sense of revelation; and revelation must wish to improve reason.—In setting aside Revelation, there must always be danger of doing harm to reason; and, in neglecting reason, there must always be danger of mistaking Revelation.

Article, we come to the Explanation: which is, as before, intended to prepare the propositions, and clear them of all extraneous matter.

The title "Of Free-will," might draw us into difficulties, because there may be some doubt about the propriety of the expression ; but every man feels what is meant by it. He seels himself chuse the right hand or the left. He sometimes perceives himself and other men chuse with great difficulty that which is right; as in case of inveterate habits, of drinking, &c.

xxIII. "The condition of Man:"—this must relate to mankind, as such; and therefore would best be conceived, in the first place, of those, who never were made Christians: though it may be applied

Volt. Louis xIV. Jansénisme, p. 263, 269, Ed. Lond. 1752.

u See Dr. Potter's Preface in Plaifere's Apello Evangelium 3

aş well as Art. 11. Sect. 111.

<sup>\*</sup> See R. Hey on Liberty, p. 22.

applied to those, who call themselves Christians

without being really fuch.

xxiv. " After the fall of Adam;" in strictness, this is not the fame as faying, 'because of the fall of Adam;' yet no doubt he would most fully agree with our church, who confidered the fall of Adam as the first beginning of our depravity, or of the undue prevalence of our inferior passions over our choice; or, as Dr. Priestley speaks, more strongly, of our "moral impotence"." - Nevertheless, as every thinking man will keep in mind the faintness and obscurity of the scriptural History concerning our first Parents, it might perhaps be worth while to extend the question, proposed under the ninth Article, to the present. I mean about the expresfion, "every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam," fignifying only, 'every' man.' I should imagine, that, had men continued in a state of original righteousness, they would have ascribed their good actions to divine affistance, in some way or other: but that state would have been so different from our present, that we cannot form distinct conceptions about it. We can see, that the more affistance we want, in order to be virtuous, the more should we ascribe to heaven when we are fo.

xxv. "Is fuch, that he cannot turn and prepare himself"— "Cannot"—may not this word be fairly understood in the same sense with the scriptural expressions beforementioned : "it is impossible," &c?—if it may, the meaning will be, that it is not at all to be expected, on a sooting of probability, grounded on experience: taking this word singly, it seems consistent with a man's being able,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Matt. xviii. 7. – Luke xvii. 1. – 1 Cor. xi. 19. – See Art. 1x. Sect. x11. & xxx

in each instance, to turn and prepare himself.—And this may point out a fense, in which God may command things impossible; he may enjoin a number of duties, each of which is practicable, though, confidering our evil habits, it is not to be expected beforehand, that we should duly perform them all'. What is to be expected, is a matter of calcution; but fuch calculations belong only to spectators; the agent has no more to do with them, than a running-horse has to do with the wagers, which are laid upon his winning: his bufiness is only to exert himself, and strive to overcome. Difficulties on this subject must arise from some fallacy; generally, from taking advantage of the different fenses of the word impossible, and substituting the idea of natural for that of moral impossibility. I do not mean to fay, that, if any one thought that man cannot posfibly, in the strict sense, turn and prepare himself to Faith, he would diffent from our Article;—I would only wish, that others should see in what fense they may affent. If it is strictly impossible for man to convert himself, we trust that God always affords help fufficient to make it possible, in each particular instance; though it seems clearly a Law of his Government, to punish our giving too much fway to any passion, by giving it still more power over us .- Yet, cannot without help, at most, means only, if he does, 'tis owing to help.

"xxv1. "Turn and prepare himself."—The word "turn" is probably an allusion to Jer. xxxi. 18.

c See Wall, p. 166.

b Council of Trent, Session 6. Canon 18.—If it was thought, that cannot rather denotes strict impossibility, then the mind must go on to the end of the Article: and the meaning will be, cannot, without help from above: but this, since all men are to try and do their best, only means, that when they succeed, their success was owing to divine assistance. According to this sense, the Law of God enjoins what it is impossible for mere unassisted man to perform.

and Lam. v. 21. passages the more familiar to our ears for having been introduced into our Liturgy. The passages in the new testament are equally necessary to be kept in mind; not only where the word turn is used, as Acts xiv. 15.—xxvi. 18. 20. but where anything is said about conversion: as Matt. xiii. 15.—xviii. 3.—Acts iii. 19. &c.—Conversion is the word often used in the five points.

The word "prepare," is chosen with a view to several passages of Scripture; Rom. ix. 23.— Eph. ii. 10.—2 Tim. ii. 21.—Such passages as Psalm lxxviii. 8. (margin) might have some effect; but Luke i. 17. has both the words "turn" and "prepare," used much as they are here.—Praparatio Gratiae, is dused by Augustin, for predestination.

xxvII. "By his own natural strength;" this expression carries us back to what was faid under the ninth Article about the nature of man, and the corruption of that nature. It implies, that man, taken at any time, has fome natural strength; or that the subordinate propensities do not totally overpower those principles, which ought to bear For, according to what was faid under the last Article, our natural strength consists in the comparative force or influence of our conscience and higher principles; and our natural weakness in the comparative force of our lower propensities. What I should wish to submit to your consideration is, whether the "natural strength," or rather natural weakness, here spoken of, is anything fixed and invariable? I should rather conceive, that the habitual weakness of our mental constitution, or na-

ture,

d Pet. Lombard, Lib. 1. dist. 40, (beginning) where Pet. Lomb. uses, "præparavit (Rom. ix. 23.) sanctos ad justitiam percipiendam;" and "præparavit iniquos," &c.—See Rhem. Test. on Acts x. 2, mentioned afterwards, Art. x111. Sect. v.

Art. 1x. Sect. xvIII. & xxVIII.

ture, is different in different ages and nations: that, if the intermediate generations between Adam and us had been more wicked, we should have been still more weak than we now are; and, if they had been more virtuous, we should now have more natural strength than we have: each generation might do something towards diminishing the natural weakness of man, or encreasing his natural

strength.

XXVIII. " And good works:" that is, his own, natural, good works; in the Latin, "naturalibus fuis viribus et bonis operibus:"-there are, then, fome good works which man, as mere man, may perform: there is a fomething which may, in fome fense, be called natural virtue; it may be imperfect, it may be infufficient to ferve as the ground of a strict claim upon God; but it may nevertheless be a great recommendation to God, (as in the case of Cornelius), and may deserve the applause and admiration of Man. We must not think, from the manner in which natural good works, acts of greatness and generosity, are here introduced, that we are forbid to be pleased with them, or even to weep over them with sympathetic joy and exultation; all that is faid is, that, according to the diforderly state of our passions, they are not sufficient, of themselves, to place us in a state of Christian perfection; fo that nothing more need be wished for, or attempted. And, though they must naturally make us inclined to accept of a pure religion, yet when we do accept it, we should humbly thank God for enabling us fo to do.

which is here meant? there is a faith in natural religion; which Bishop Warburton understands to be described in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle the Hebrews: "without faith it is impossible to

pleale

please God." " For he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently feek him." Could our reformers mean to speak of Faith in general? No, it appears to me, that they meant Christian Faith; such faith as is spoken of in the following Articles: the fubject in view is conversion to Christianity. The article fets forth an inability to acquire Faith; how is that inability to be supplied? by "the Grace of God by Christ;" the faith which is acquired by such help, must be faith in Christ. This is also implied in the words, "turn and prepare."-That Faith is the preliminary to conversion, is evident enough; from Mark xvi. 16 .- Acts xv. 9. and Ephef. ii. 8. where being faved, means being admitted into the Christian covenant; as Mr. Locke shews in a note on the latter paffage 8, well worth the perusal of every one, who is studying our present Article.

xxx. "And calling upon God:"—this must be considered as a kind of technical expression; in its ordinary literal sense, it has no force in this place: any Pagan, surely, can call upon God: the phrase is used here, when joined with Faith, as it is several times used in the new Testament, for enterance on a course of Christian worship. Let any one compare Acts ii. 21. & ix. 13, 14. & Rom. x. 13. with Joel ii. 32: there he will meet with the term just mentioned, "saved," which will shew how properly the phrase, "calling upon God," is joined to "Faith." I suppose, if we were to go as far back as possible, we should find a more extensive sense for this phrase; namely, worshipping God in an acceptable manner.—Acceptable worship must vary with circumstances;

Heb. xi. 6. Z Locke on Ephef. ii. 8.

See Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, under επικαλεομαι,—the second sense.

224 BOOK IV. ART. X. SECT. XXXI. XXXII.

cumstances; but, when Christianity comes to be published, acceptable worship must be Christian

worship.

"Wherefore;"-this word divides the XXXI. Article into two parts; the former may be confidered as premises, the latter as conclusion. manner of drawing the conclusion may not feem strictly logical;—we cannot convert ourselves to Faith and right worship, therefore we cannot do works perfectly good, without divine affiftance.-Perhaps the full force of this deduction may not appear till after the thirteenth Article: therefore we should endeavour to see what is our proper business at present. We are not to dwell on the nature of good works, for that subject is found in the twelfth Article; we are not to shew how only Christian good works are, in strictness, completely acceptable to God; for that is the business of the thirteenth Article. It was unavoidable to bring the expressions into this Article; but our proper question is, supposing works good and acceptable, to what are they to be ascribed?—taking this for the proper matter of the Article, the flavery of the will in the former part, is rightly connected with the divine influence on the will, in the latter part.

not to repeat what has been faid about the word "cannot"—this does not mean, that we, as men, cannot contribute anything towards the performance of our Christian Duty;—nor are we to understand from it, that we are to suspend the performance of

our

There may have been an idea of joining in one Article, what is fometimes made the matter of two; and this may have made the connexion of the former part with the latter, less smooth than it might have been: yet, throw out what does not properly belong to this Article, and then, I think, the conclusion is well enough connected with the premises. — See Note's near the end of Sect. xv.

of

our duty till we are fure, that we have that affiftance which is here declared necessary. The countryman, who requested the affistance of Hercules. because he had no power to forward his own cart, was not therefore to be excused from exerting himfelf; indeed we may be faid to have no powerk to do a thing, though we come ever fo near doing it, if at last we fall short.—The latter observation here made refults from the fort of affiftance given: "what king, going to make war against another king, fitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?" -if, in fuch a case, he cannot previously know that he can procure, from allies, the necessary aid, he declines the combat; -but, in spiritual difficulties, in "moral" impotence," the affistance is invisible, communicated in a manner, which we do not comprehend; we are therefore to attempt the performance of our most arduous duties, with our best efforts, and in the same manner as if all depended on our felves, only begging of our invisible protector, that he would help our infirmities.

good works which are so, are here opposed to our own natural good works, before fooken of: the works meant, then, are virtuous actions performed on Christian principles, and regarded by God as done by men in the capacity of those belonging to that society,

k See Bp. Sherlock, Vol. 2. Disc. 4. p. 79.

<sup>1</sup> Luke xiv. 31, 32.

m The reader need scarcely be reminded, that this is Dr. Priestley's expression, quoted Sect. xvIII. from Familiar Illustration.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Sect. xxvIII.

of which his Son is the head; in the relation of branches to the P Vine.

" Without the Grace of God by Christ XXXIV. preventing us."-Grace is here used in the customary sense, for internal influence on the mind; more particularly such as is immediate.—Though the word prevent is now most commonly used as fynonymous to hinder, yet the Latin, and our Liturgy will make any explanation unnecessary.— Indeed we still hear sometimes of preventing mens wishes 4. To prevent, is to come before: now, any person may come before another, either so as to feize upon that advantage which the other was aiming at, or fo as to provide some benefit or enjoyment; so as to have that prepared for him, which it was most probable he should otherwise have been obliged to prepare for himfelf.

xxxv. We now pass on from Explanation to the *Proof*. After we have made the proper referves for the subsequent articles, we seem to have but sew propositions left: the two following seem to comprehend every thing, which is affirmed in the Article.

1. We cannot convert ourselves from being Heathens (or as Heathens) to the state of true Christians.

2. We cannot perform good works, strictly so called, without the assistance of God; without his aid, both in the formation of our good purposes, and in the execution of them.

This is the form, into which it is natural for us to throw our propositions in the first instance; but thinking upon them, and imagining ourselves to enter

<sup>°</sup> Ephef. i. 22.

P John xv. 5.—Jonathan Edwards impresses this idea, I think, in his long discourse on Justification.

The word let formerly meant the opposite to the modern let.

enter upon the proofs, will make us wish for some alteration. As the propositions now stand, it seems to be implied, that we are first to procure our assistance, and then to begin our task; but it has already been observed, that the particular nature of our assistance requires, that, at the same time that we own its reality, we should make our attempts and exertions as if we had none: therefore it would be better (on this account, and for other reasons which may hereafter appear) if our propositions stood in some form better suited to the nature of that assistance, which can be most fully conceived on a review of its effects. As thus,—

1. When we have been converted to Christianity, we should thank God, and give him the Glory.

2. When we have done any virtuous actions (or what would be commonly called fuch) we should ascribe them, as far as they really are virtuous, to the assistance of God. And we should thank him both for the good dispositions and the good actions.

It should be observed, that, as the affistance which is given from above, is not understood by us, as our notions of it are extremely indistinct, so should be our acknowledgments. But a Christian is bound to make his acknowledgments through Christ: or, to consider all the spiritual benefit which

If one was to hear, that a man was so ill, that he was unable to get out of bed without help, nothing would seem more clear than that he would lie still till help arrived.—See also the misapplication of Ezek. xxiv. 27. (not an exact quotation) in Whitesield's first dealing, cited in "The Principles and Practices of the Methodists."—p. 18.

<sup>·</sup> Sect. xxxii.

228 BOOK IV. ART. X. SECT. XXXVI. XXXVII.

he receives, as coming to him from the vine, of which Christians are the branches.

Christianity, we should thank God, and give him the glory. This will sufficiently appear from the sollowing texts. Jer. xxxi. 18.—Lam. v. 21.— John vi. 45. 65.—xii. 40.—xvi. 13.—Acts xv. 9. and xvi. 14.—I Cor. xii. 3.—Ephes. ii. 8.—Phil.

i. 20.

To which may be added those texts, in which the influence of the spirit accompanies baptism; as John iii. 5.—Titus iii. 5, for that influence must be requisite to complete the conversion.—And, if we compare Titus iii. 5. with Mark xvi. 16. it will appear, that the faith, by which we are faved, or admitted into the Christian religion, is a gift of the spirit. For, in the one passage, the requisites are Baptism and the Holy Spirit; in the other, Baptism and Faith.

xxxvII. The fecond proposition relates to both dispositions and actions.—As to our dispositions, several of the texts just now mentioned might be produced again: as those from the old Testament, and Jer. xxxii. 39. Ezek. xxxvi. 26. & John vi. 44. 65. For though, in the particular circumstances, in which they were spoken, their first and immediate view might be to conversion, yet they are expressed generally, and may be applied to mens coming to do right actions at any time. Bishop Hurd has treated John vi. 44. in that sense. We may add Phil. ii. 13.—Also Eph. ii. 8, and perhaps Acts xv. 9, in both which texts, faith is ascribed to God; saith being a constant principle of action.

That our good actions are to be ascribed to divine grace, is evident from many passages. Phil. ii. 13. may be mentioned again; God worketh in us not only to will, but to do.—Add Rom. v. 5.—Rom.

BOOK IV. ART. X. SECT. XXXVIII XXXIX 229

viii. verses 13, 14, 16. 26', 27.-1 Cor. iii. 16.-Gal. v. 16.-Ephes. iii. 16, 17.—The doctrine is delivered more at large, 1 Cor. iv. 7. and 2 Cor.

jii. 5.

Reasonings from Adam, as opposed to Christ, and from Eph. ii. 2. might here be admitted, in order to shew, that the remedy should operate upon our minds, because the disorder lies there.—
The good derived from Christ is also much greater than the evil derived from Adam. And the min-ber of the things revealed in Scripture concerning the Holy Spirit should be attended to: such communications must have been intended for some purpose or other.

Church, in all ages, has been right in professing some doctrine of Divine Grace; yet their precise meaning does not seem capable of being ascertained by attending to the mere expressions. In order to acquire a notion of that, we must recollect some of the elementary observations, which were offered in the Introduction to this second part of

our Articles.

anguage must be, does not express acts of the mind as it seems to do, in the way of Theory or speculation; it should be construed as expressing merely our feelings, and our wants, with some view to good. In order to see its true meaning, we must see what practical end it has in view.

Whatever may have been faid by writers, about the speculative doctrines of Scripture, if I were to hazard an observation, I should rather be inclined

to

<sup>&#</sup>x27; See Short Defence of Atonement, p. 85. quoted by Ludlam, Scrip. Met. p. 5.

Rom. v. 20.

\* Introd. to Part 11. Sect. 1v.

to fay, there is no fuch thing in scripture as a speculative doctrine, relative to the subjects most commonly controverted; there are expressions, which have been collected and extended fo as to form such, but that is the work of Man. I do not conceive, that we have, in Scripture, any Theory of what is called the doctrine of Grace. In many inflances, our conversion, our good designs and actions, are referred to God, but in every instance the thing really expressed is, some good feeling, with a view to promote some good principle. The good feeling is generally pious gratitude; the end in view, to promote either that same, or humility, or fome virtuous or religious fentiment y. -If there was a Theory of the doctrine of Grace, properly speaking, the propositions concerning divine affistance would be universal, and might be used on all occasions; trifling as well as important; future as well as past. Nay, an action inspired by God, might be pronounced good, beforehand, instead of being ascribed to him, after it was performed, as far as it was good. But we find no fuch universality in Scripture. When we hear this popular language in common life, we generally can

Calvin, about his Catechism, meant no more when he said, "in quo scribendo Dominum mihi adsuisse consido."—
I readily allow, that both Calvin and Augustin savoured Divine

agency.

Y Here might appear the boyish and slippant objection of Leclerc and Jortin to Augustin, for referring a discovery about divine Grace, made in reading the Scriptures, to the divine assistance: See Jortin's six Dissertations, p. 33, 92. There is no appearance to me, that Augustin pretended to Revelation in the sense, in which these two writers take the word; or that he meant any more than to refer the correction of his error to God; in the manner of the instances mentioned in this Section. His phraseology was pious of course; and that is enough to produce his expression. Whether his former opinion was a real error, makes no difference. God only knows that.

fee the end, which is aimed at, and what is taken for granted. M. Luther would fay, 'It has z pleased God to enlighten my mind, and employ me to rescue his religion from popish superstition.' -Cardinal Bellarmin, 'By God's help, I have reflored many to the Catholic faith, who had been feduced into calvinistic herefy.' Each taking his own religion for true, refers the protection of it to God; and with a view of promoting a zeal for its fuccess.—The forming of our Liturgy is referred. to the Holy Ghost: in 1548, the expression "by the aid of the Holy Ghost" was used; some objected to it; but others explained it in a manner not very different from ours. - The Scripture fays, "what haft thou b that thou didft not receive?" we must not think we have the right meaning of this question, till we see the end aimed at in proposing it; namely, "lest any man' should boast;" expressed in these words, "why dost thou glory?" Nor must we think, that we apply it in the right fense, except when we use it as a motive to humility.

b 1 Cor. iv. 7. c Eph. ii. 9.

There is a passage, in the third part of the Homily of Good Works, which might be mentioned here; "Honour be to God, who did put light in the heart of his faithful and true minister, of most famous memory, King Henry VIII. and gave him the knowledge of his Word, and an earnest affection to seek his Glory, and to put away all such superstitious and pharisacal Sects by Antichrist invented, and set up against the true word of God, and glory of his most blessed Name, as he gave the like spirit unto the most noble and famous Princes, Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias."—This expression seems no more than a pious and indistinct reference of the benefit of part of the Resormation to the Deity; made by those who took for granted, that the Resormation was a real blessing; but not under any presumtion of knowing the mind of God beforehand.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Burnet on the Reformation, P. 2. B. 1. (Vol. 2. p. 93, 94.) See Book 1. Chap. XII. Sect. III.

lity. Suppose any one used it thus; 'I have no virtues which I did not receive, therefore it is in vain for me to endeavour to improve my morals:' the conclusion is not unfair, on a footing of Theory; yet every one sees it is a fallacy. It is, in truth, a misinterpretation of the Apostle, arising from giving too literal a sense to popular language; and not construing his words by attending to his practical design.

This observation supplies us with a solution of the difficulty proposed by the Pelagians, which is mentioned in Jerom's Letter to Ctesiphon:—if we are to refer our virtues to the divine assistance, why not our most vulgar and unclean actions?—no one can shew a reason, on a sooting of mere Theory: but it is reason enough to say, because referring such actions to the divine assistance would answer no good end, promote no virtue. Jerom only exclaims against the profaneness of such language.

This objection of the Pelagians reminds one of the Journals of Mr. Whitefield, Mr. Wesley, &c. who refer almost all events to the divine assistance. Some have thought, that they make pretensions to an extraordinary communication with the Supreme Being: those, who understand them in this sense, will take care not to give credit to such pretensions but upon sufficient evidence: upon such evidence as they will not be ashamed to produce at "the judgment-seat of Christ." It seems to me, that they may possibly mean only to refer plain sacts to the Divine agency; from an imitation of the sacred writers: if this be the case, they seem to consound different situations; and sometimes to refer events too trivial, to the agency of heaven; as a shower

d Bp. Gibson; see his 4th Pastoral Letter, p. 261. - Also end of Sect. x1x.

e Principles and Practices of the Methodists considered, p. 17.

of rain, for instance, or a journey f to Bath. If they are, as some have thought, evasive; if they wish to run from one of these plans to the other, as they are driven; if they wish to have the lower people think them inspired, in a manner different from common men, yet express themselves so, that, when they are charged with this, they can give their narrations a different sense; they appear more blameable than either for mere enthusiasm, or for want of discriminating cases somewhat alike.— Farther, I have not a decided judgment on this matter.

XL. In order to get at the true fense of popular expressions, it should always be remembered, that fome words, which have a positive found, have only a negative fense<sup>h</sup>. With regard to expressions, by which actions are ascribed to the divine influence, I will only fuggeft, that every man should watch his own mind, and prove his own thoughts, that he may be aware what it is that he comprehends clearly and distinctly; that he may judge rightly how far his particular conceptions of divine influence on the mind extends. Does our distinct knowledge really extend beyond the following proposition? it would be wrong, impious, irrational, to exclude the Deity from power over the thoughts of men? or from any action, on which an human being values himself. Every man furely would be ready to fay, 'as God does influence us, I know not but he may in this particular inftance; I fee not

f Gibson, 262. References to Satan seem much of the same kind, and subject to the same remarks: Mr. Whitesield refers his idleness at College, to Satan, without dissidence: See his First Dealing, &c. p. 67. quoted in Principles and Practices, &c.

Principles and Practices farther considered, p. 29.
Introd. to Part 11. Sect. v11.

not how far, but to exclude him would be shocking; suppose he did, would not such or such a consequence follow? — and some men may think, that this is the chief of what is really meant by

faying, God causes our thoughts and actions.

XLI. Causes affigned as total, are often only partial. Hence, ascribing to God, need not exclude human endeavours: nor need human agency exclude divine: either, or both, may be affigned; and which shall be affigned, is determined by some practical good in view; according to the observation made in Sect. XXXIX. St. Paul, in Phil. ii. 12, 13. affigns both divine and human agency; we are to work out our own falvation with fear and trembling, because God worketh in us "both to will and to do of his good pleasure:" because we are assisted by one, by a partner, as it were, or affociate, with whom we may not trifle; who is engaged in affifting us by no views of interest, but assists us from a benevolence, which the greatness and majesty of his character makes deeply affecting. St. Paul also, in Rom. viii. 13. gives much the same idea. "If ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the Body, ye shall live."-Christians are the agents, but they perform their duty through the Holy Spirit. Nor is this peculiar to the new Covenant; the Psalmist does the same. "Except " the Lord build the House, their labour is but lost that build it: Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman

Hey on Atonement, p. 45. Note. - Introd. to our 2d Part, Sect. v 111.

k Grotius speaks as if Civil Government might be referred wither to God (Rom. xiii. 1.) or Man, (1 Pet. ii. 13.) De Jure, &cc. 1. 4. 7.

<sup>1</sup> That is, with care and respect, as appears from Psalmii. 11. (Bible).—Dan. vi. 26.—Mark v. 33.—1 Cor. ii. 3.—2 Cor. vii. 15.—Ephes. vi. 5.

m Pfalm cxxvii. 1, 2.

watchman waketh but in vain." See also Psalm xliv. 3, 4. where it is not to be supposed, that the Children of Israel did not fight.

And, as it is fometimes most useful to refer things to both divine and human agency, it feems, on tome occasions, a matter of indifference to which they are referred. St. Paul, in I Cor. xv. 10. first gives a plain relation of his diligence; then immediately gives the same over again, in a way calculated to make a good impression, or raise a religious sentiment: first he says, " I labour more abundantly than they all:" then he fays, "yet not I, but the Grace of God, which was with me." It is the same relation, as to fact, whether he fays, "I laboured," or "not I:"—the latter tells us no more than the former. In 2 Cor. xi. 23, he expresses his comparative diligence, by the words, "in labours more abundant," without any reference to the divine agency: but his business was not then to encourage pious gratitude and humility, but to maintain the dignity of his own character. which had fuffered under aspersion. In an instance before-mentioned, things were to be referred to God, lest any one should glory; but, in the present instance, St. Paul says, he "must

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>n</sup> In Shakspeare's Tempest, Act. iv. Scene 1. Prospero says to Ferdinand,

Thus as my gift, and thine own acquisition Worthily purchased, take my daughter.

this is natural popular language; in firiciness, the same thing is not a gift and a purchase.

o It might not be amifs here to fee the manner, in which acts are referred to God the Father and to the Son, so that one being considered as a cause does not exclude the other. Eph. i. 9. compared with texts in which Christ makes known the Will of God. The Father gave his Son, 1 John iv. 9. 10; the Son gave himself, Gal. i. 4.—See Pearson on the Creed, p. 259. 410. or p. 130, solio.

needs glory:" he was called upon to support his honour.

It feems to follow from hence, that, when either the divine or human agency is mentioned feparately, the other must be considered as implied.—St. Paul, when he speaks of himself as "in labours more abundant" than some other ministers, certainly did not mean to exclude the Grace of God: nor, when he was told, that God's Grace was sufficient for him, did he understand, that he was not to endeavour to extract the thorn in his sless.

The strongest expressions of divine agency are those, which represent God as creating a right spirit, or good works, or causing a resurrection of those, "who were dead in trespasses and sins."—

Yet.

P St. Peter says (2 Pet. iii. 18.) "grow in grace." St. Paul says (Eph. v. 18.) "be filled with the spirit;" though in one case the Christian is active, in the other passive, yet they must mean the same thing; we seem to say indifferently, 'I incline to such a thing,' and, 'I am inclined:' which should be considered as an exteriment, shewing how easily the mind changes from the idea of acting, to that of being acted upon.

9 2 Cor. xi, 23. . . 2 Cor. xii. 9.

Thinking, that this "thorn in the flesh," was the disorder of fore eyes: for that disorder a friend once recommended to me Smellome's continent, which seemed to succeed: on our meeting after my recovery, I should naturally say, I am indebted to you for being able to read and write comfortably: were the proprietors of the ointment to ask me after its essicacy, the answer would as naturally be, it cured me, when other things failed.—Were I speaking with a religious view, the natural expression would be, 'it pleased God, such a night, to relieve me from my "thorn in the Flesh."—The fast is one only.

Matt. vi. 26. Our heavenly Father feedeth the fowls of the air: not furely without any endeavours of their own.—It is an act of rational piety, in Grace at meals, to refer our plenty to God; but such devotion does not lessen the care of those, who

furnish the repast.

Eph. ii. i.

Yet, from Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. and Ephes. ii. 10. and v. 14, 15. it appears, that we may be spoken of as agents even under such representations: to

walk, is the part of one " who is active.

XLII. When we wish to get the exact sense of popular expressions, we must always consider in what circumstances they are " used: for every such expression, being of a practical fort, must be made in order to fit certain circumstances: and therefore missing the right circumstances, is missing the right fense. - It requires some attention to find out the circumstances, to which any saying is adapted; but, if many instances occur, one may discern what things belong to them in common. -- Let any one then try whether future actions are not represented in scripture as dependent on human agency; and whether actions ascribed to divine agency, are not in some sense pasty. As in the case of Lydia; her conversion, as an effect a, is referred to the Lord's opening her heart as a cause. If this proves to be a rule, we have no right to talk of Grace in general: and it should be seen, at some time, that referring our past good actions to God makes us humble and pious; though, to lay our past bad actions on God, would increase our wickedness; but referring any future actions to divine agency, would make us neglect our own part; would hinder

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Archbp. Sharp's Sermons, Vol. 3. Ser. 13.

<sup>\*</sup> Introduction to Part 11. Sect. 1x.

y Sect. xxxv. 

Acts xvi. 14.

Whenever the effect comes, it is as past; and the cause is prior to the effect: if some declarations of divine influence in scripture, seem free from the idea of time past, as John iii. 5.— Titus iii. 5, suppose an instance, and then this observation applies.—Observe also, that educon, John vi. 44. may be rendered, shall have drawn.

b Wall feems to have felt fomething of this, p. 168. "It is one thing thankfully," &c.

der us from doing our best. It might also be gathered, from the scriptural instances of referring events to God, that no trifling events are referred to him; the reason of which has been assigned; but, if we saw no reason, the uniformity of the practice would be sufficient to lay a restraint

upon us

It may be likewise observed in scripture, that where an author is entering into the views of the agent, he speaks as if our will was free: where he enters into the views of the spectator, as if the will was influenced:—which agrees with what was laid down about freedom and necessity; but, without that, would have afforded a sufficient reason why we should do the same: in this light we may compare, it must needs be that offences come, with Isaiah's description of the age of discretion in man; that age when he knows to refuse the evil, and choose the good. Or with St. Paul's dilemma; what I shall choose I wot not, for I am in a strait between two."

If the scriptures do, in a constant and uniform manner, speak of future actions as depending upon the human agent, it must appear natural, that rewards and punishments should be proposed without reference to divine agency. Nor does there seem any reason for its being introduced in the grand description of a future judgment contained in the twenty fifth Chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel.

Some popular expressions, which seem to be affirmative, or speculative, are merely declamatory. Readers of scripture should be aware of this, when they see expressions about divine Grace: all which

feem

c Sect. xxxix.

d Introduction to Second Part, Sect. v.

<sup>•</sup> If. vii. 15. f Phil. i. 22, 23.

feem designed to excite good sentiments; and belong more to the Heart than the Head.

The New Testament adopts Jewish modes of referring evil to the divine agency: as when it speaks of hardening, blinding, &c. but this, being the most difficult part of our subject, had better be

referved, as the Hiftory of it was, to the laft.

XLIII. The result of what has been said seems to be this; take a man, in his moral or religious capacity, at any instant, and he is to set out upon principles of free-will and human agency; these will include praying to God for spiritual assistance. When he has proceeded in a course of good living, or what may be ordinarily called fuch, he is to look back upon his conduct with humility, and ascribe it to the influence of the Holy Spirit, with pious gratitude. Thus he fets out a fort of Pelagian, and finishes his course as a follower of Augustin.

Not that he must be unmindful of the assistance which he receives, as a Man, from Conscience, and intellect; and from the continual proofs which he may find, in the course of nature, of an hatred to vice and a love to virtue, in the author of nature and Governor of the world.—This affiftance has been confidered as the first grace of God; and as

that, by which an Heathen may be faved.

XLIV. I have now finished what I meant to offer in the way of direct proof of the propositions contained in our Article. But some indirect proof feems requifite here, as well as on former Articles; there are some objections, which are of weight enough

to deferve an answer.

It may be asked, is not this subject too intricate and perplexed for the generality of mankind? and does not this manner of treating it make it more so? particularly, is there any such thing

See Jortin's fix Differtations, p. 84.

thing as getting a clear conception of the beginnings of preventing Grace and free-will?—We answer, it is not necessary, in order to shew the truth of a doctrine, to prove, that all men can comprehend it. We have had an whole Chapter on unintelligible Doctrines, and we have allowed, that the doctrines of the first, second, and sisth Articles are all above human comprehension. But we may believe the reality of divine influence, without understanding the particular manner, in which it operates.

Our manner of treating the subject does require fome thought, and some power of distinguishing; but every man makes as many distinctions, and that very frequently, in the common affairs of life, as we require. Whoever will let his mind ply freely to circumstances, only in the same way he does in interpreting common discourse, will make references to Divine assistance in a right manner, and with right limitations; and will understand them as they are really meant, when they are made

by others h.

If any one asked, in particular, which begins first, preventing Grace, or virtue? I should not scruple to answer, I do not know: if our part is clear, we may safely leave the part of God to himself.—Our business is, to profess that God inspires us, and that we are to ascribe to him our good thoughts and actions. Now, we are not hindered from professing either of these things, by our ignorance of the nascent operations of divine and human agency. No time can be assigned, when we cannot thank God for any virtuous act or purpose, of which we are conscious. The nascent acts of mutual sympathy.

h See Principles and Practices, &c. p. 49, 40. "many diftinctions may be necessary now, which were not so when his (St. Paul's) Epistles were written."

pathy, or friendship, are almost as unintelligible as those of divine influence and human virtue.

XLVI. Is not the general tenor of the scriptures as if man was free? is it not full of precepts, commands, Laws, which presuppose freedom? Does not conscience imply the same? Are we not exhorted to repent', and "grow" in Grace?" Nay, are we not told, that, "if a' man" " purge himfelf,"-"he shall be a vessel unto honour, fanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared (the word of our Article) unto every good work?"-Can the supposition of our being passive, impelled in some mysterious manner, stand against sayings so plain and intelligible as these?—If our remarks are accepted, I apprehend, that an answer has already been given to this difficulty. It is now proposed in order that, in case they should not, another may be offered. - Free-will and Grace are opposed; but are they really incompatible with each other?why may not they both be received? even though no reconciliation between them should be attempted?-they feem both to be received by our" Church; and also by Augustin. If they both are separately proved to exist, they are reconcileable in their nature, though we should not, at present, know how to reconcile them.—Indeed experience feems to shew, that they do exist together, in the minds of thousands.—We will, then, grant our objector, that there is no harm in his referring actions to the agent; nay, that it does not imply any falshood: we only defire him to grant, that to ascribe good actions to the Deity is more pious; and therefore, on some occasions, more proper, nay, with a view to religion, more prudent; as it will

Acts iii. 19.

will correct and amend our principles, by exciting

fome good fentiment or affection.

xLVII. It may be urged, that it is inconsistent to say, that past actions only are the objects of the scriptural sayings concerning Grace, when it is certain, that we are commanded to pray for it; which

implies looking forwards into futurity.

But all the prospect we have of Grace, in praying for it, is very obscure; all the notion we have of it then is quite indistinct;—that there is fuch a thing may, to be fure, be feen at any time, or without any relation to time. Prayer is an action itself, which we may refer, with a retrospective view, to the divine affistance°. It implies endeavours in active virtue accompanying it .- It is itself an endeavour; an effort to procure the means of acting well; and in this light it is feen in future, as human agency; There feems nothing as well as the end it aims at. unfcriptural, when we are using any honest endeavours, in hoping for future affiftance, in fome indefinite manner. In short, prayer may, in some way, mix ideas of divine and human agency; but does not imply any contradiction to our notion, that particular actions are not to be confidered as inspired, till they are past.

xLVIII. It has been objected, by a Friend<sup>p</sup> of mine, to my way of interpreting and limiting paffages of Scripture relating to divine Grace, that it has an appearance of lowering their importance, and also the importance of God's revealing the perfonality of the Holy Spirit. But it seems to me, that this is only a temporary appearance, which would

go off on confideration.

1. It

<sup>•</sup> Rom. viii. 26.

P Mr. Twining, the author of the work so well known and so much esteemed amongst the learned, on Aristotle's Poetics.

tures to look upon them as written in popular language: if they were not, they would in reality be written in no language at all; that is, in no words, which would convey ideas, especially to such perfons as they were addressed to. The connexion between words and ideas is arbitrary, and wholly dependent on custom: sounds, to which we are unaccustomed, are no language; and, if those sounds were like something we were used to, they would confound us the more.

2. Though references to divine agency may be indistinct, and though the words which express them may require limitation in getting at their real meaning, yet they may be ever so important: they may be sublime, affecting, and in short may warm the

heart to virtue and piety.

3. It is furely of great importance to see all expressions about Grace in such a light, that they shall leave the efficacy of rewards and punishments undiminished; and shall afford no pretence for remissions in spiritual diligence. So long as our part in working out our salvation is disentangled from mystery, the part of God may safely be committed to the clouds and darkness, which surround his Throne.

4. It does not appear, that the power of the Holy Ghost is limited, by our notions, either upon the understanding of man, or upon his will.

—On the other hand, it is consistent with those notions, to maintain, that virtues may be referred to him with a fuller considence because his particular office is revealed: though still his influence be only mediately perceivable, and though the manner of referring virtues to divine agency continues as before revelation.

5. Lastly,

5. Lastly, could we flatter ourselves, that our manner of extracting the good from different opinions, would have a tendency to silence disputes, we might venture to say, that it would be the means of making the scriptures generally re-

spected as they deserve.

xLIX. But, though Christians should be brought to respect Scripture, yet still the same objection remains with regard to insidels, which was mentioned under the preceding Article. Will not any doctrine of Grace disgust men of plain common sense; or of philosophical minds, and make them averse to Revelation? particularly, by taking religion out of the regions of experience and common sense, into those of sancy and enthusiasm? and by establishing a fort of doctrine of necessity, on the ruins of freedom of will?

First, with regard to experience. That men are influenced and affifted by the Holy Ghoft, we do not learn merely by experience; but there is nothing in the doctrine, which is contrary to experience. The rational Philosopher will allow, that there is an over-ruling' Providence; though the manner in which it rules, in particular cases, is unknown. Why therefore should it be objected to the doctrine of Grace, that the manner of influencing minds is not understood? It is as likely, that God should influence mind as matter: to exclude him from the former, when his influence upon the latter is allowed, feems a great inconfiftency, supported by no philosophical reason.-When men encourage themselves in rejecting the operations of the Spirit, because they do not see them, they are apt to fancy, that they do fee the objects, which excite their passions. The objects indeed

Art. IX, Sect. XL.

See Powell-Discourse xiii. p. 218.

indeed they do see, in some sense, but in one that is but little to the purpose; because they see nothing of the manner, in which those objects exercise any power over their minds. They see too the lightening and the earthquake, they hear the thunder; which they may call, with the Pfalmift, "the voice' of the Lord;"-but the application of these to the moral government of the world, they understand as little as they do the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit.-Many material things raise or depress our spirits, draw us into speculations of a chearful or melancholy fort; we know not how; nor are we fensible of the effect, till experience shews us it on looking back; what prefumption can true philosophy entertain against the same kind of fecret influence from heaven?

Enthusiasm has , in fact, been owing to presumption; those who have believed the reality of Inspiration, thinking that if they were inspired they must feel it, have presumed, that their internal sen-

fations were immediately from God.

And, with regard to the doctrine of Necessity, if the Christian doctrine of Grace did introduce it, I see not that the Philosopher need be disgusted on that account: many able men have \* favoured that doctrine, independently of Christianity. The scheme of necessity is misunderstood, if it is thought inconsistent with Virtue, or any part of moral discipline. Hartley says, "By the mechanism of human actions I mean, that each action results from the previous circumstances of body and mind, in the same manner, and with the same certainty, as other effects do from their mechanical causes."

Pfalm xxix.

Powell, Discourse xiii. or p. 216.—Enthusiasm was treated Book 111. Chap. xv. Sect. x1.

causes." This, however, he allows to be confiftent with each man's having a power " of deliberating, fuspending, chusing, &c. or of resisting the motives of fenfuality, ambition, refentment, &c." -But faying, that certain motives will produce certain volitions, feems fomething like Sir Isaac Newton's fecond law of motion, the change of motion is proportional to the moving force impressed; to which, objection has been rightly made, as being an identical proposition; because the force can only be known à posteriori, by the change of motion. Waving formal definition, it is easy to conceive the mind acted upon, without confidering it as acting; the Will as passive, without thinking of its activity.—Virtue is not excluded by this way of viewing the mind; for that confifts in calling up good motives, so as to overpower the bad ones: and it implies a character, which is something fixed: rewards and punishments move the mind, and are proposed on purpose that they may do fo; conscience acts as both reward and punishment; exhortations, and all the parts of education, move the will, and occasion good volitions. will itself must be supposed to exist, because it is constantly impelled; and therefore a necessary action is still a voluntary one.—If any one evaded his duty, on pretence that he was a machine, he must be punishable for his inconsistency, as he would not cease, on that pretence, to secure his property and provide his fustenance; and his very evafion would bring on evil, which would act as a motive to reformation.—Our familiar use of the word motives shews, that we really do admit all this, whether we recognize it in systematic form, or not.

Let

Hartley, Vol. 1. p. 501. Dr. Powell's M. S. Lectures.

Let not any one think, that I am particularly a favourer of the hypothesis of Necessity; I am, in truth for both Freedom and Necessity, according to the explanation before b given; from which, I think, it appears, that they do not interfere with each other: and may and do exist together: both hypotheses seem capable of admitting virtue and moral discipline. The phænomena of freedom, or the train of thoughts arising in that system', arise from the Agent's feeling himself free to chuse: the phænomena, or train of thoughts in the fystem of necessity, arise from the Spectator's observing how a man chuses, and according to what rules: and from expecting, on a footing of experience and probability, that the same causes will produce the fame effects. From whence it follows, that the language of Freedom is that, which the Agent naturally uses; the language of Necessity that, which most naturally occurs to the Spectator.—It feems as if it should be remarked, that there is a possibility of some kind of deception in that internal feeling of Liberty, which we never dispute. Brutes do not kill themselves; yet I should think it highly probable, that the Lion, could he speak, would tell us, he could tear and kill himself as well as he can his prey; only he will not: the necessitarian fays, he cannot, because he has no motive. In like manner, when a Hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; she would fay, she chuses to do so, for their good; the necessitarian would say, that infinct compells her to gather them; or causes her choice; and that only just till the brood can take care of itself. There is also to be remarked a considerable degree of regularity in the choice made by

b Introduction to Part 11. Sect. v.

Book 111. Chap. xv. Sect. 1x.

men: else indeed what could be depended upon? what order, government, union, could be maintained? this regularity is much less perceived by the Agent than by the Spectator: therefore, when we speak of the part of each individual, we speak, with him, the language of Freedom: when we speak of men collectively, and of disposing or governing them, we speak, with the Spectator, the language of Necessity. But, if a man would be perfectly free from difficulty, he must learn to pass from one conception and language to the other, This will be confirmed with eafe and readiness. if we confider, as accurately as possible, what it is that we really do know of a volition. I should think, nothing more than this:—feveral objects of choice offer themselves; each displays its peculiar advantages; we chuse one; or one is chosen; for our ideas are fo faint, that we judge chiefly from the effect. There must be choice; and the Will must be influenced; the volition may be seen in either light. When we describe it, or its effect, in words, we do it by comparison; we compare it to weighing, commanding, impelling, or fomething which happens in common life.—On the whole, disputes on the subject of liberty and necessity, however numerous they may have been, may be pronounced vain and idle: as much fo as if you was placed within a spherical surface, and I without it, and we were to enter into abstruse mathematical arguments on the question, whether the surface between us was concave or convex: in my fituation it is convex, in yours it is concave.

We may therefore close the present objection with observing, that, though the scriptural doctrine of Grace did favour the scheme of necessity, it need occasion no aversion to the Scriptures in any man of a philosophical mind, on that account;

Dut

but that the truth is, the Doctrine of Grace is only a small part of what is contained in the Scriptures; the language of the whole, taken together, is always the language of Nature, and therefore varies with occasions and views of things.

The Philosopher should remember, that Heathens have referred even virtues to Divine Agency; as we shewed in the second Section of this Article.

L. Having then finished our Proof, direct and indirect, we come to that matter, which was referved: the referring of evil to the Agency of the Supreme Being. Evil may be ascribed to God as the matter of his Decrees, or as infused into the mind. Decrees belong to the seventeenth Article;

all influence on the mind, to the prefent.

The first thing to be mentioned is, God's giving men over to a reprobate Mind: we have several passages, in which something occurs to this purpose.—Rom. i. 24. 26. 28. may be reckoned the principal; but others may be seen: Matt. vii. 6.—1 Cor. xiv. 38.—2 Tim. iii. 13.—Rev. xxii. 11.—It may be permitted to add Ecclesiasticus

Whatever fault there may be in these texts, it is not to be charged upon Christianity: because the Author of Nature gives men over to a reprobate mind, and all we want to prove is, that Christianity comes from the Author of Nature. The more a man indulges any appetite, the stronger it grows; artificial or unnatural cravings perpetually gather strength, till recovery from vice becomes desperate.

In this case, a man is commonly called an abandoned sinner. To defend this Rule of God's Government, is the business of natural religion. But we may observe, by the way, that, as Man gives up attending,

attending, when he has loft all probability of fuccess, it cannot feem unnatural to him, that God should do the fame. In man indeed this sometimes happens because the quantity of his attention is limited; but that is not always the case. At least, we may conceive, that a fort of punishment will probably be effectual on man, which falls in with his received notions and practices. And there can be no impropriety in punishing drunkenness by thirst, or gluttony by immoderate d cravings: nay, it must tend to increase mens caution about the beginnings of all illicit indulgencies, and therefore to keep the mind in a state of Purity.—Then, I do not imagine, that any man is ever totally irrecoverable from vice; only that it is morally impossible, not to be expected, that some should recover. Nor is the scripture to be so understood as if God ever gave men over in any other sense but as it may be faid, that God gave a drunken man over to sottishness, or a prodigal to profusion. Men get into bad habits in the common way, and then these habits, considered as a part of God's Government, are properly referred to God, as in fome sense their cause. So the Gentiles got into habits of vice, natural and unnatural; when that became a past event, it might, when set in a proper point of view, be referred to the Supreme Being .

Some persons seem to have a notion, in some way of theory, that God's Grace abandons some wicked men; and that, without Grace, they

d This is called by Turretin, making a Sin the Punishment of a Sin.

e Pfalm lxxxi. 12, 13. But my people would not hear my voice, and Ifrael would not obey me; fo I gave them up unto their own hearts' lufts, and let them follow their own imaginations.

cannot possibly recover. But this I should call unwarrantable speculation: it is as if there were some act of God previous to the worst degree of wickedness, which we could diffinctly ascertain, and which put it out of man's power to avoid that wickedness; but there is no such thing: till men confine themselves to referring past events to the divine agency, they will ever get wrong. Suppose the fact, that a man was become thoroughly wicked, and then there would be no impropriety in describing his flate as one in want of the Grace of God; but, in that case, piety would attend as much to the recovery as to the fall. Again, suppose the fact, that a man has made a strong effort to rouse himself from his spiritual stupidity; let him be faid to have been awakened by the grace of God; it is right, pious, and not untrue: but to think a man out of the possibility of reformation, because his actual profligacy may be ascribed, indistinctly, to his being deferted by the divine Grace, is to pervert and mistake the language of scripture, and to forget the manner, in which it was originally introduced and applied.

Not but we might refer unfavourable events, though arifing from faults or vices, to God, in certain respects, when it would excite good sentiments: for there is no evil, of any kind, which is out of the reach of God's Government; none which he does not behold as within the system of things, which he has appointed; none therefore which may not be referred to him, when viewed in that light. But what is evil in some respects, can generally be seen to be good in other respects. If a robber is about to kill me, and a friend of mine, in my defence,

kills

f Sect. xv111. from Racovian Catechism.—Also end of Sect. xx.

kills him, I may thank God for the event: but not as an act of homicide, only as a deliverance. If a Tyrant acts as a fcourge s in the hand of God, his tyranny may, on some occasions, be mentioned as owing to God; not as tyranny, but as punishment.—In almost any evil, a reference may be made to God, when the purpose is to make it felt, that the most profligate cannot throw off God's Government: that, lawless as they may feel, though they may do themselves and others harm within certain bounds, yet that they are limited in doing mischief; and that God is able to turn even their wickedness to the forwarding of his grand inferutable designs in the government of the universe.

In short, the good arising out of evil is generally the thing referred to God, when our imperfect language seems to refer to him the evil at large.

Something has been already haid of the phraseology of the Jews. We may add, that they seem to have referred more events to the agency of Spirits than we do now. As most men have a general belief of the existence of intelligent beings between Man and the Supreme Being (nothing can be more narrow-minded and unphilosophical than to deny their existence) and yet as we know nothing particular of their agency, it is no wonder, that men have run into very different degrees of ascribing events to it. At the revival of learning, about the time of the Reformation, many more references were made to Satan than are at present. If our form of indicting criminals were

now

g "His scourge the Tyrant." POPE.

h Sect. 111. and xx.-Also end of Introduct. to Part 11.

i The following paragraph appeared in a newspaper in 1791: it may tend to illustrate our present remark.—The damage, considerable

now new, we should not find it faid, that each committed his crime at the instigation of the Devil. only mean to suggest, that this matter, of referring events to spirits, is, in a great measure, arbitrary; and therefore the Jews might refer many events fo. and our Saviour might comply with the custom. I should think this enough to account for several things in scripture, and particularly for the expres-

fion a Spirit " of flumber; or stupidity.

God is fometimes faid to blind men, as to their understanding, and to harden them, as to their Heart 1. But this, furely, does not imply any act of the Deity, which should be allowed by man before the blindness or hardness is acknowledged as a past event. Even Calvin " observes, " Nec tamen sequitur reprobos, proptereà quòd indurantur a Deo, a seipsis non indurari." So far from it, that it is often an indifferent matter, which mode of expresfion is made use of, God's hardening a man, or his hardening himself: only one fact would be described, though both expressions were used: namely, a man's

fiderable as it is, which has been done to the church at Rainham, in Kent, finks to nothing when compared with what happened at the church of St. Julian's, in Shrewsbury, about the year 1500. when, as their own Doomsday Book stateth, " the divelle dyd put his clawe upponne the clapper of the great bell, and from his clawe there yssued a slame of siyre, which dydde melte yverie bell in the church, threwe the fpyer upponne the grounde, and meltydde moche of the braffe worke candyl ftyks,-because an holie and righteous Monke hadde in a fermonne spoken tauntinlie offe his power and auctoritte upponne earthe!"-" Thus did our pious and philosophic ancestors solve an electric cloud."

Rom. xi. 8. from If. xxix. 10.—1 suppose ωνευμα means a Person here. The Holy Spirit has several names in a similar

Form. See Parkhurst.

m Opuscula, 12mo. p. 314.

I Twees fignifies blind, also an hard substance; hence wweew may be translated to blind or to harden; See margin of Rom. xi. 8. and Hefychius.—But in John xii. 40. we have τετυφλωκεν for oplanus; - wernequest for xagdian.

man's doing some act of wickedness, which may be ascribed, after it is committed, to human agency or divine, as you wish to excite an abhorrence of the fault, or gratitude to God for bringing incidental good out of that fault. Pharash was perverse and tyrannical, in not suffering the Israelites to depart out of his dominions: if you speak of this as a fault, Pharaoh hardened his own heart; if as a part of divine government, to which the Jews ought to be gratefully attentive, you fay God hardened his heart; that is, by granting him respite: both forms are used in scripture"; but neither implies, that Pharaoh's obstinacy did not arise as that of obstinate men commonly does°. There are about four passages, it which it is said, God will harden; but no new fast is implied: nor is any fact to be conceived, but "he shall p follow"-"they shall follow."-In like manner, the numbering of the people is, in one place q, ascribed to God, in his anger; and in another to Satan: the first belongs to the subject of God's Government, as the context shews, (though the marginal reading is, "Satan"); the last, to the subject of David's blameable distrust. The difference has no relation to the head, but only to the heart: that is, the different modes of expression do not give different information.

Ouos Deus vult perdere priùs dementat. Did God harden the heart of Pharaoh more than he hardened the hearts of Vespasian and Titus?

n Exod. viii. 32.—ix. 7, 12, 34, 35. The forms feem to be used almost indifferently; compare ix. 16. with 17.—Yet we have no authority for saying, 'God hardened my heart'—that would promote Sin.—It seems to me, that the phrase had grown so familiar, that it got to be tossed about, and used in any tenses. St. Paul uses it, but to Jews; and maintaining the sovereignty of God, against the impertinent claims of Jews, to election, &c.—We modern Christians have no business to use it.

P Exod xiv 4, 17.

<sup>9 2</sup> Sam. xxiv. 1 .-- 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

information, but only excite different feelings. If God is spoken of as suggesting a punishable act, it is as punishment, which, as a part of good government, demands our devout admiration; if Satan suggests a punishable act, it is as fin, which should excite our abhorrence.

LI. Having finished what was reserved, we come to our Application: consisting of the same

parts as in the preceding Articles.

We are first to see how near an Article of natural religion will approach to that before us; supposing us to take care, that we say nothing unauthorized.

—One who was not a Christian might profess as follows, after what was professed under the preced-

ing Article;

The condition of man, as described under the preceding Article, is fuch, as would make it extremely difficult for men even of the more virtuous fort, to enter into the plan or affociation there proposed, for amending and improving our moral principles; it is a thing, indeed, to be deemed visionary, and beyond rational expectation. If it should be accomplished in any instance, he who finds himself in so happy a state, would have reason to think it a great bleffing, and to thank Providence for having conducted him into fo defirable a fituation. His virtues might be expected to flourish there, and his disposition to improve continually. He must, however, be careful to fee even these improvements of conduct and principle, in a right light. He must not grow proud of them, but still look up to Heaven with a grateful heart, and continually ascribe, with warm feelings rather than with precise ideas, all his improvements, both of disposition and conduct, to the gracious influence of him, who, being the fountain of light, illuminates the human' mind with the rays of his divine wisdom; and, being a God of purity, gives to man, when well disposed, a taste and relish for whatsoever things are pure.'

Christian.—In what sense can he give a solemn assent to the tenth article of our Church? in the

following;

'The condition of Man, as described under the preceding article, is fuch, that even men of diftinguished characters for probity and virtue, cannot be expected to convert themselves to so pure and perfect a Religion as Christianity.—This is not faid, in order to prevent their attempting it; no, it is only the fuggestion of experience and probability. -Let them exert themselves as much as possible: let them strain every nerve to escape from the flavery of fin :- But, if they fucceed, the fcripture shews, in many places, that they ought to thank God, and give him the glory of their conversion.—In the community of Christians, their conduct may become more acceptable to God; but even here, when they do anything which is good, it appears from scripture, that they are to thank God, not only for the action, as far as it was really good, but also for the disposition which led to it.

fo much of what has been faid has been calculated to fettle controverfy, that they need not be dwelt upon.

On our part, some good might perhaps be done by altering the form of our Article, so that the doctrine contained in it, should not seem to make our endéavours useless, till we knew, that we had sufficient

Leland's View, vol. 1. p. 24, 4th edit. referred to in Sect. 11.

fufficient affistance. The Article would pretend less to Theory, if the conversion and other effects were mentioned first, with some words of scripture about our refusing evil and chusing good, and something promoting diligence, and if then we were directed to look up to the divine affistance as a cause; as a cause of something seen and experienced. And it might suit some men better, without omitting any essential doctrine, if the reference to our first Parent was made faint and indefinite.

As to the part of our Adversaries, it really seems as if every Christian might be expected to assent to our Article, when modified in the manner, which has been described"; because no Heathen would refuse to affent to any parts but those, which belong to Christianity at large, or to Christians as Christians.—The referring should indeed be some way shewn to require no precise ideas.—But, if our Christian brethren, with whom we wish to coalesce, were to scruple affenting, they might, in religious worship, allow us to use devout forms in speaking of God as of him "from whom all holy defires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed:" and might agree to some extensive forms of doctrine, in which it should be declared, that, as the doctrine of Grace ought not to prevent men's chusing and endeavouring, according to the best of their abilities; fo neither ought the doctrine of free-will to prevent men from being humble, and giving God the Glory on every occasion.

LIV. Improvements

<sup>&</sup>quot;Whenever we do, or defign, anything good, we should give God the Glory; especially because of our hereditary depravity."—Would this express every thing essential in our tenth Article?

u Dr. Powell shews, that disputants have differed less than they appeared to do, on our present subject. — Discourses, p. 299.

whether these things \* are so: Whether in natural religion, or metaphysics, circumstances confirm what we have said of *Liberty* and *Necessity*: Whether texts of scripture can be classed, as we have imagined, into language of the Agent, and language of the Spectator: Whether, and how frequently, heathen authors ascribe virtue to the Deity.

For a conclusion, I would adopt the conclusion of Dr. Jortin's first Differtation's: as from that he feems to have had the same feelings with myself, or some of the same, though he does not appear to have analyzed his feelings so as to establish regular principles, upon which his notions could be supported.

\* Acts xvii. 11.

y "Thus do the doctrine of divine Grace and the doctrine of free-will, or human Liberty, unite and conspire, in a friendly manner, to our everlasting good. The first is adapted to excite in us gratitude, faith, and humility; the second, to awaken our caution, and quicken our diligence."



## ARTICLE XI.

## OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

W E are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith; and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

1. In passing from the tenth Article to the eleventh, we pass from the Closet to the Tribunal; from the principles of action of each individual, to his trial at the judgment-seat of Christ.

We begin, as usual, with History.

The notions of the Jews are those of the greatest importance to us; because it was in arguing concerning them, that the Apostles laid down all those positions, on which the various doctrines concerning Justification have been founded.—Two things seem most worthy of notice; their notions of their hereditary privileges, and of the sanctity of character resulting from a strict conformity to their ceremonial Laws.

They persuaded themselves, that God could not hate or condemn the children, when he had shewn such favour to the Fathers: this notion is expressed

with some foolish extravagance, as may be seen in several authors.

They had a notion of a perfect character, formed by a constant attention to niceties of the Law.— Not only, I suppose, the written Law, but the oral, or traditional.—This was, probably, a character which, in every instance, admitted of faults, or moral defects; but it was one, to which the Jews looked up with an habitual reverence and admiration; insomuch, that whoever approached to it, had his moral soibles overlooked.—A person of this character had the title of pro-yer of Chasidim, from Ton benignus, pius; the word used in Proverbs of the holy man.

respect of this Article; only I may mention, that Bp. Sherlock makes Faith to be the principle of natural Religion; that is, reliance on God's affurances of future invisible good.—It is not likely, that Heathens should have occasion to speak much about any opposition between external actions and internal religious principles.

it is probable, that Christians went on in simplicity and godly sincerity, doing their duty, and looking up to God and Jesus Christ for their reward: so that any mention of Faith and works in the primitive writers would be accidental; and it would be practical, rather than speculative. I see there is a passage in the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus, which is to our purpose: Archbishop Wake translates it thus,—" And we also" (compared with the Sons of Abraham) "being called by the same

will

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Nicholls on the Art. and Michaelis's Introd. Lea. Sect. 129, 130. quarto.

Prov. xi. 17, " the merciful man."

Discourses, Vol. 1. Disc. 14. on Heb. iii. 12. p. 369.

will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or the works which we have done in the holiness of our Hearts; but by that Faith, by which God Almighty has justified all men from the beginningd." Polycarp mentions, in an artless manner, fome who are gone to Heaven, "in Faith and righteousness.—It seems needless to search for more instances.—Dr. Nicholls produces two good paffages, one from Basil, the other from Macarius; but they were confiderably later. feems as if Christian virtue had at first been plain, fimple, and unaffected; but afterwards, more oftentatious: when it became fo, there was more need of lowering the value of works, and infifting on the felf-denying pretentions to reward founded on the merits of Christ.

The fifth century we have found very bufy about original fin and Grace, but it was not equally so about Faith and good works. The writers of that age opposed divine to human agency; but did not contend much about the different parts of human agency, when contrasted with each other. Not but we frequently meet with the terms, Faith, works, Justification; but what is said of them soon flides into fomething about Grace or Predestina-Thus Augustin fays, " non opera, sed fides inchoat meritum," &c -but then he is speaking of those, " quos elegit Deus."-(De Predest. Sanct. cap. 3. Ed. Ben.) Justifying Grace was more the topic than justifying Faith; that is, justifying Faith confidered as the gift of God .- (Eph. ii. 8.) The eleventh Canon of the fixth Seffion of the Council of Trent, may give some idea of what I mean "Si quis dixerit, homines justificari vel solà imputatione

<sup>4</sup> Sect. 32. Wake.

<sup>·</sup> Sect. 9. Wake.

tione justitiæ Christi, vel solå peccatorum remissione, excluså gratiå, et caritate, quæ in cordibus eorum per spiritum sanctum dissundatur, atque in illis inhæreat; aut etiam gratiam, qua justificamur, esse tantum favorem Dei; anathema sit." Augustin seems, from Rom. xxviii. 30. to have settled in his mind, that, as vocation preceded justification, and vocation was a part of divine agency, so must justification be also; which, with St. Paul's other expressions in the same passage, would make him refer the whole to Predestination.

In his book de Spiritu et litera, he enters upon a formal discussion of the Law of works as opposed to the Law of Faith; but, at bottom, it is all a proof of the necessity of Grace. His book de side et operibus seems written in order to obviate some errors actually prevailing, about baptism being sufficient, though those, who were converted and baptized, continued to lead wicked lives.

And what Vossius mentions in his Pelagian History about Faith, chiefly relates to the subject of Perseverance, and therefore belongs to the fixteenth Article.

v. The Schoolmen have their niceties on our present subject, as well as on others. A few specimens may be seen in Nicholls; but the part, which will be most interesting, is that which shews, that, before the Reformation, the Romanists were more moderate about the doctrine of good works than at the Reformation. Indeed so they have also been since.

vi. But the principal æra, fince the complete publication of Christianity, in the History of the doctrine

Does not this feem the opposite to Dr. John Taylor's idea of the sense of xages? Art. x. Sect xvIII.

on the 5th Pfalm; and to Simplicianus 1st Book and 2d question; quoted by Nicholls.

doctrine of our eleventh Article, is that of the Reformation. Good works had then got to imply particularly, founding monasteries, giving or bequeathing money for maffes, prayers for the dead h, or for shrines, &c .- that is, in short, good works had got to fignify commutations for fins, and fupports of superstition. These works must be depreciated, or reformation could not be effected.-And what so likely, in the heat of dispute, as that the Reformers should say very strong things against the strict merit of any kind of good works, and should extoll, in an unqualified manner, the necessity of founding all pretensions to reward, on the merits of Christ?—some of the Reformers are thought to have gone too far in this way; and their adversaries probably represented them as going farther than they really went.—Du i Pin, in his compendious History, gives this account of Martin Luther. "Upon this principle, that man is justified by Faith alone, Luther advanced forty propositions more on the 26th of April, wherein he carried the matter fo far, that he took the boldness to maintain, not only that good works are not necessary for falvation, but that, how good soever they might appear, they were mortal fins; that man has no Liberty; that all works done without Grace are finful; that invincible ignorance is not excusable, and that the involuntary motions of concupifcence are k fins."--On this matter, I feel myself

h Our last Homily (or part) on Good works, throws contempt on these, and ends with shewing what are really good works.

i Vol. 4. p. 16.

k One may see here the ground-work of some of our Articles, though the expressions are those of an Adversary. Art x 111.

puts heathen virtues on the footing of Sins. Man's having no Liberty, or his will requiring givine affistance to make him

myself most inclined to observe, that the Reformed have departed so much from the rigour of their doctrine about Faith, and the Romanists from theirs about good works, that there seems now very little difference between them. Happy were it if the same could be said with regard to all other subjects! But, with a view to our Article, we must attend more to opinions held at the time of the Reformation, than to those held at this time.

vii. I know not that we can fee the notions of the Romanists, at the time of the Reformation, better any where, than in the acts of the Council of Trent. Some of the fet of Canons before " referred to, belong to our present Article. The 9th and 12th Canons are most immediately our concern. They are so cautiously drawn, and with such limitations, that it seems hazardous to dispute about them; in the former, Will is opposed to understanding; in the latter, the word qua is ambiguous". However, they would be useful to the Romanists in seeming, at least, to oppose the reforming innovators.

viii. The

choose rightly, comes into the tenth Article.—And the sinful nature of vicious sentiments, or concupiscence, into the ninth.—That a man may suffer by not being a Christian (including in the word suffering, loss of happiness) though he has no opportunity of becoming one, Dr. Balguy forcibly maintains.—Perhaps if Luther said, that goods works are not necessary for salvation, he might take good works in the technical sense just now mentioned, for commutations for sins, and supports of superstition.

Burnet, p. 162, Svo.—Principles and Practices, p. 75.—In which last work, p. 73, mention is made of Sacramental Justification; for which see afterwards Art. xxv. Sect. 11. latter end.

m Art. x. Sect xiii.

" My idea is, that the Romanists, at the time of the Reformation, held, that works are meritorious; but that they were made so by the merits of Christ.—Is the difference important? or is the distinction one, which can be made by the human understanding?

The Church of England, at the time of the Reformation, was, as usual, sober, candid, and moderate. The Necessary Doctrine gives much the fame idea of Justification with our Article: and that the notions it contains are, on our present fubject, to be accounted reformed, appears by what is said in the part relating to Good Workes, against "munkes, friars, nunnes, and fuche other."—The part relating to Justification, as we may judge particularly by the conclusion of it, seems to have been composed with the same general design as that concerning Free-will; namely, to retain both the doctrines, which are opposed to each other, without attempting a formal reconciliation between them. Which agrees with what a very of fensible writer mentions as the defign of the Homily referred to in our Article; it "gives" fays he, " no occasion to a reader, who considers the whole with attention, either to magnify too highly the efficacy of Faith, or depreciate too much the necessity of good works."

Our Reformatio Legum says, "Nec illi sunt audiendi quorum impietas salutarem et in sacris scripturis sundatam justificationis nostræ doctrinam oppugnant, in qua tenendum est, non operum

momentis, justitiam hominum collocari."

1x. The Calvinists and Arminians have held such opinions on our present subject as might be expected. But it did not enter into the samous five Articles or points. The Arminians are said not to have been quite uniform and ingenuous with regard to Justification by Faith.

x. Antinomians

e Supposed to be Bishop Green of Lincoln.—Principles, &c. p. 69. p. 66.-73. deserves well to be read: might very well be read at Lecture.

Mosheim, Index, Arminians.

Antinomians have been of different ages and countries; and we have already had occasion to fpeak of them more than once.—Justification by Faith is one doctrine, by which they are most diftinguished. Luther has been called an Antinomian, though he writes against them .- They relied to on Faith, as to undervalue morality.— Their doctrines, at least, have had that appearance; and it has been faid, that their Teachers have been thought to discharge the whole of their duty, if they inculcated the Necessity of Faith, and difplayed the Benefits of the New Covenant.-The manner, in which they express themselves, may be feen in a review of Dr. Crispe's Sermons by Geree: the Epistle to the reader will be sufficient. Some of those, who have been called Methodists, have ascribed great efficacy's to Faith .- But we shall meet with Antinomians again under fome of the fubsequent Articles.

Herefy by preaching up the natural powers of free-will; and thence ran into another dangerous extreme of confidence in their own sufficiency, teaching, that they might deserve heaven by their own righteousness."

xII. Our doctrine may be traced from the Reformation down to the present Century.—The Puritans always wished to depart farther from the Church of Rome, than the generality did; and one doctrine, in which they thought this desirable, was Justification by Faith. They were constantly labouring

<sup>9</sup> Art. VII. Sed. III. and Art. x. Sed. XII.

From this Epistle to the Reader, it appears, that some high Antinomians required nothing on the part of Man; not even Faith. The work here mentioned being now no longer famous, I may as well say, that it is in Sidney Collège Library, T-5-38.

Principles, &c. p. 57. Ridley's Life, p. 344.

labouring to answer this end; and, in the time of Charles I. they got into power. They were not, however, able to get their notions kindly received by our nation at large. They had thrown every thing into confusion; their manners were unpleasing; and their doctrine itself disgusted plain reasonable people. The Restoration came on; nothing was more natural than running into the opposite extreme: for some ascribed even the political confusions, previous to the Restoration, to the great stress laid on the doctrine of Justification" by Faith: on the idea, that it lessened men's esteem for Virtue, and made them easily give up any duty, of the man or the citizen, when they were earnest in any pursuit, where such duty stood in their way.

Nevertheless, though the Restoration was in 1660, men did not fairly get into the opposite extreme until the beginning of the 18th Century. The stiff zeal of the sectaries was first softened by those eminent men, who were called Latitudinarian \* Divines, from shewing the contending parties, that they were narrow-minded, and quarrelled more about words than fense. These men met with unmerited abuse, as men are very apt to do, who think for themselves, and adhere to no large party: ere long, Faith came to be refined away into nothing: nay, at length, an attempt was made to prove the perfect coincidence between Christianity and Reason, by shewing, that our Religion was only a republication of the Law of Nature.-This attempt was made by a Clergyman, an eminent orthodox Divine, but gave occasion to Dr.

Tindal's

y Warburton on Grace, p. 319.

<sup>\*</sup> See Bp. Warburton on the Holy Spirit, p. 317. 12mo.

<sup>\*</sup> Hales, Cudworth, Baxter, &c. - This taken from Warburton on Grace, p. 316. 321. 12mo.

Tindal's celebrated Deiftical book entitled "Chriftianity as old as the Creation, or the Gospel a republication of the Law of Nature."

I will close this History with mention of XIII. the Socinians. In the Racovian Catechism, there is a Chapter on Faith, and another on Justification. In that on Faith, there is a division of Faith into two kinds, faving, and not faving. The latter means mere affent or belief of Truth; the former includes obedience. In the chapter on Justification, we have these words, "Per fidem in Christum confequimur justificationem:" and the definition of justification feems to give the fame idea with our Article. The rest relates to the Justification of those, who lived before our Saviour. modern Socinians differ much from us with regard to what is called the doctrine of Atonement, which is intimately connected with our present doctrine, or may be called a part of it; but, as we propose making that the subject of an Appendix, we may defer making any Historical remarks upon it for the prefent.

And first, we must take notice of the Title; "Of the Justification of Man."—The sense, in which Justification is taken here, seems sufficiently ascertained by the first words of the Article, "we are accounted righteous:" justification is being accounted righteous: but it would be better to get a more enlarged idea of a word so much used in Scripture: the word admits of several different sense; all that we have to do is to see how they are connected: what Mr. Hume says of Association of ideas in general, seems true of connexion of the different senses

E See an account of it in Leland's View, Vol. 1.

This is like the beginning of our Homily on Faith-2d. part.

of the fame word in particular; they are connected by refemblance, contiguity, and causation .-There may be some doubt which sense is the primitive, but, that once ascertained, the rest may be traced b. The primitive sense of the word Dixaiogun seems to be goodness, or benignity, of temper: and this being the principal ingredient in Virtue, when spoken of in the complex, or at large, Δικαιοσυνη takes the fense, (as goodness does), of Virtue, in the complex; or, according to the language of our Translation, of Righteousness: which feems to mean, ideal perfection in Virtue in general; as Aixaios feems to mean the ideal model of a virtuous man. A word, which fignifies a disposition, may easily come to fignify an instance of that dispofition; we speak of kindness as in the mind, and as an actual favour; this is a fort of causation. But, under the Mosaic dispensation, rewards being conferred immediately, whoever received a favour from God, must be conceived in the light of one accounted worthy of it; that is, righteous; -hence dinason might fignify, to confer a favour upon, or to account righteous; and Sixaiwois, and Sixaiooun might denote either favouring, or righteousness, or justification .- Thus Rahab was faid to be justified, when the was delivered from the calamities of a fiege; David was justified d, when he was delivered from his persecutors. Man is justified, either when delivered from the flavery of fin, and put in a way of obtaining happiness under the Christian Religion; which is fometimes called being faved; or when.

b We traced the fenses of the word Spirit under the fifth Article.

See Taylor on Romans; Key, Chap. 16.—Also Principles and Practices, &c. p. 44. about Rahab in particular.

d In David's case, dixasooun is generally, or always, translated Righteousness.

Locke on Ephef. ii. 8.

when, at last, his falvation is fixed for eternity. As these two instances of the Justification of Mankind have been sometimes confounded, and the confusion has occasioned dispute, Divines, and our Church, have called the admission into Christianity our first justification, and our salvation after death our final justification.

The word diraction, the Greek for Justification, occurs more frequently than the English reader is aware of, it is so often translated righteousness.—

Jer. xxiii. 6. "The Lord our righteousness," might be expressed, the Lord our fusification: but it seems often a doubt which word should be used.

But, though there may be occasions, on which it is useful to distinguish between a first and a sinal Justification; yet there may be others, on which the distinction may be neglected; as, I think, it may in the Title of our Article; so that Justification may be considered as being accounted righteous, on any occasion whatsoever, or without reference to particular occasions. And in this general view it seems to retain its forensic sense.

Justified is opposed to condemned, Prov. xvii. 15.

—Matt. xii. 37.—Rom. viii. 33. — Which agrees with what has been said: being condemned is being accounted unrighteous.

xv. "We are accounted righteous before God:" this is not the same as saying, we are righteous. If, indeed, we are made righteous by the righteousness of Christ, we may, or must, be accounted righteous;

F See Necessary Doctrine, &c. Article of Justification.— Where there is mention of encreasing our justification, and of being restored to it.—Taylor (on Romans) uses first and final.

See Taylor's Paraphrase on Rom. iii. and other parts of his work. In Latin, we should be aware, that the word fusitia varies its senses, so as to resemble, in some measure, those of diagroous.

righteous; but it may not be certain, conversely, that, if we are accounted righteous, we must be made so. The doctrine, that the merits of Christ become actually our merits, or his righteousness our righteousness, is what Mr. Ludlam denies, in his Essay on Justification, against Mr. Hervey and others.—Imputed righteousness is opposed to inherent: but righteousness may be imputed, though at last we are only accounted righteous; but then it is not a personal quality.—"Righteous" means persect in our bedience.

avi. "Only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;"—We must remember the word "only," when we come to, "justified by Faith only;" as we cannot be justified by two things, and by each of them only. "For the merit," in Latin, propter. "The merit of Christ;"—this is more general than sacrifice, death, satisfaction, or atonement: a person who merits, does more than satisfy. However, the death and sacrifice of Christ are expressed in the second and thirty-sirst Articles.

xvii. "By Faith."—What do we mean by Faith?—Reliance on the promises and engagements of another; but sometimes Fides¹ means Fidelity, which is a principle of observing our own promises and engagements.—And why may not Faith, when any one enters into an agreement, or Covenant, imply both these? both considence in others, and honesty in ourselves?—it is with a disposition compounded of these, that every man of honour enters into every engagement; and that is

h Taylor's Key, Chap. 16.

i Of this a farther account will be given in the Appendix to this Article, Sect. xx.

k Locke's Reasonableness, &c. Works, Fol. Vol. 2. p. 474, 476, 477. quoted by Jonathan Edwards—Sermons 12mo. p. 80.—See Taylor, p. 120. Note; from Theognis.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Πιςις, in Greek, feems to have the fame fenfe. "Πιςιν επιτιθεναι, fidem dare, jurare," Demosth.—Πιςιις ωνιησασθαι " fiduciam promissorum sirmare." Xen.

what I should call the right disposition for any agreement. I consider Faith as most usually, and most properly, understood in this sense: the disposition of an honest man entering into any contract, or other business.

" By Faith"-in Latin, per fidem, and afterwards, "folâ fide:" we must particularly obferve, that it is not, propter fidem; but it was " propter meritum Domini, &c." because this shews. that the two things opposed are, the merit of Christ, and our good works; we are justified on account of the former; we are not justified on account of the latter: therefore Faith has nothing to do in the opposition: to fay, we are justified by Faith, and not by works, is to fay what the Article does not warrant. Why then, it may be asked, is any mention of Faith introduced?—Because Man is justified on being admitted into the Christian Society, or covenant (to take that inftance); and he is not admitted into it as an inanimate, or as an irrational being, but as Man; and therefore he must have the disposition of an human being, in order to his admission: he must have that fidelity, which every plain man has on entering into every fociety; or on taking upon himself any set of obligations. God accounts man righteous for one reason, not for another; this is all the part of God; man has no part to act: unless accepting be deemed a part. indeed, is fometimes feen in the light of Virtue; but, if it was here, man would be justified for his Faith, not by it -Our Homily expresses these things fully and clearly m. Mention of Faith could not be wholly omitted, because it is so frequently said in Scripture, that we are justified by Faith.

fervings."—In the tenth Article, two forts of good

<sup>\*</sup> See Book of Homilies, 8vo. p. 15. 20. 22. 23.

works were mentioned, natural good works, and good works acceptable to God, or Christian virtues; which fort is meant here? I suppose, either; as the mind happens to be attending to the first, or the final justification.

But it appears to me, from the whole Article, as far as we have gone, that, before we can rightly apply the doctrine of this Article, we must be supposed to have been in a course of "well-doing;" according to the best of our opportunities; the meaning seems to be the same, as if it had been said, 'though we exert ourselves as much as any persons in our situation can be expected to do; yet, after all, we must be, at our trial, or in the eye of divine fusice, considered as righteous, not on account of our actions, but on account of the merit of our Lord.' The words of the Article, taken without this supposition, would mean, that the most wicked man possible is accounted righteous; which is absurd.

If this be true, we may observe, as under the preceding article, that, in practice, we are to set about leading virtuous lives, with great earnestness, and on the best principles in our power; just as if all depended on our own diligence and discretion. And that it is not till after we have pursued our Christian course for some time, that we are either to look back on the affistance we have received, or forward to the judgment which we are to undergo.

xix. "Wherefore;"—this word enables us to compare what went before it, with what comes after it:—and warns us to fee there be no inconfiftency.

"That we are justified by Faith only;" folâ fide;

this expression, from what was just now observed, must mean the same with being justified for (propter) the merit of Christ. Faith only is evidently a technical expression, but we have found a way of ascertaining its true fignification. In our Homily, the expression is sometimes, "only Faith," which feems better, as having a more technical found: and it is the same in the Article of 1552. In the fecond part of the Homily on Salvation, it is shewn, that such a mode of expression was in use amongst the ancient Fathers. And the meaning of it is said to be, "freely, without works,"according to an expression of St. Paul: and the meaning of, " without works," is declared to be, not that good works are to be omitted; but that they are not to be thought the meritorious cause of our Justification.

xx. "Is a most wholesome Doctrine."—This expression implies, that different doctrines were maintained at the time; and that our Church sell in with those, who held, that men are justified by "only Faith;" that is, sell in with the reformed.

This doctrine is declared wholesome, as tending to prevent vain-glory, and as generating humility; as inducing men to give themselves up p wholly to God, as exciting their devout affections; as making them grateful to God, and kind to all their brethren, the partakers of his protection. The Doctrine is not said to be "certain," as in the Article of 1552; yet the former part of our Article affirms its truth.

This doctrine is also said to be "very full of comfort," as making us members of the Christian religion,

P. 19. 8vo. Salvation 2d part. - better p. 22. 8vo. third part.

P Third part on Salvation, end.

religion, and so giving us better hopes of the favour of God, than we could otherwise have: as shewing us how God makes us "his dear children, brethren unto his only Son, our Saviour Christ, and inheritors for ever with him of his eternal Kingdom of Heaven."

of Justification."—This is a part of our Article, which seems to afford us Liberty, when it is compared with the Article of 1552. In that, men were required to profess the Doctrine of Justification, "in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of Justification." So that the whole Homily became an Article. By the present Form, we are only called upon to declare, that the Homily expresses the doctrine more fully than the Article; which we might declare, even though we thought, that the Homily contained some things, which we did not approve.

But one difficulty remains the same; namely, to determine what is meant by "the Homily of Justification:" no Homily is extant, or ever was, in our Church, bearing that title. Some have thought, that the Homily "Of the Salvation of all mankind," in three parts, is the composition meant: or the second and third parts of that Homily. Salvation is nearly equivalent to Justification. But my idea of Justification as a title of declarations of Faith, is taken from the Canons of the sixth Session of the Council of Trent. Under Justification are included all the doctrines of ten of our Articles, beginning with the ninth. Now, in our first Book of Homilies (and what we want must

<sup>9</sup> Homily of Salvation, near the end.

Bennet on the Article.

Principles and Practices, &c. p. 67.

Taylor on Romans, p. 116.

must be in the first book, because the Article of 1552 refers to it), after an introductory one, as it were, on reading the Scripture, come four on the subjects treated at Trent under the Title of Justification; Human Mifery, Salvation, Faith, and Good works .- These may be called doctrinal, but that which follows about Love, or Benevolence, or charity, is practical; and so seem the rest. The same subjects do not recur. There is a short Preface on Good works in the fecond Book, but it is only to introduce a practical discourse on Fasting. My idea therefore is, that the compilers of our Article meant, by "the Homily of Justification," these four: which may be called eleven, (a long Article!) as the first is in two parts, the rest in three, each. Ridley", in his life of Bishop Ridley, says, that our church referred to the Homily, lest the short expressions of the Article should occasion their being thought Lutherans\* in faying we are justified by only Faith. He thinks, that "the Homily of Justification" included all that I do, except the Sermon on the Misery of Mankind. He does not give any reason for his opinion in this point; nor does any other writer that I remember,

XXII. We come now to the Proof.

The Article before us feems, in reality, to contain but one proposition, 'We are justified by only Faith:'

<sup>&</sup>quot; Book v. Sect. vii.

<sup>\*</sup> Those who professed Justification by "only Faith," have been called Solifidians.

I Salvation means so much the same with Justification, that I should scarcely dispute with any one, who judged the expression of the Article, "the Homily of Justification," to mean only the Sermon, in three parts, entitled "Of the Salvation of all Mankind." See the end of the first part on Good Works, where the Thief would have lost his Salvation; which expression might be compared with some in the Necessary Doctrine about losing Justification.

Faith; but the expression "only Faith," or "Faith only," implying a negation of works, we might perhaps as well take two propositions, the one negative, the other affirmative.

1. We are not accounted righteous before God

for our own works.

2. We are accounted righteous, when at all, for the merit of Christ: or, we are justified by Faith.

The proof of these propositions given here, can scarcely be more than a specimen of what is to be found in the Scriptures; it may be sufficient, but it cannot well be full. A person, to see the full proof, must read the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians entire, and that of St. James; and must study their scope or tendency; and that of several other parts of Scripture. Taylor's Key to the Apostolic writings, would be of great use to such an one; we cannot well do more than select a few texts.

xxIII. We are not accounted righteous before

God, for our oven works.

What has been faid under the ninth Article is fufficient to shew this. And we may examine Luke xvii. 10.—Rom. iv. 4, 5.—Rom. xi. 6.—Eph. ii. 9. and other passages of like import.—Phil. iii. 4. 9.

Our Homily \* feems to me to describe well the imperfection of our principles, affections, and ser-

vices.

Salvation is spoken of in Scripture as the Gift of God, as opposed to debt or wages: we may confult John xvii. 2.—Rom. vi. 23.—Eph. ii. 8.—

1 John v. 11<sup>b</sup>.

xxiv. It

<sup>2</sup> Art. Ix. Sect. xxx. the proof.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Page 12.8vo. Second part on Misery of Man.

b I had not feen the ninth Book of the Divine Legation of Moses, when I wrote this.

xxIV. It is the same thing, at least in the sense of our Church, whether we prove, that we are justified on account of the merit of Christ, or that we are justified by Faith:—both however are true.

We are restrained in our proof of Justification through the merit of Christ, by our plan of reserving the doctrine of atonement for an Appendix: we may, notwithstanding, refer to Rom. v. 18, 19. before mentioned.—Phil. iii. 9. and Heb. x. 17.

Justification by Faith is expressed in a great number of texts. Mark xvi. 16.—Acts x. 43.—Acts xiii. 39. — Rom. v. 1.—Rom. iii. 28.—31. Gal. ii. 16.—Gal. iii. 11, 12. 26.

xxv. I shall leave the remaining part of the proof to each person's private reading, for the reason already assigned; and shall proceed to some indirect proof, or to answer a few objections.

xxvi. Is there not a confusion in the texts now alledged, between the Law of Nature and the Law of Moses? or between the Works enjoined by those Laws? It feems to me, as if an observation made under the feventh Article would be a sufficient The Epistle to the answer to this difficulty. Romans may prove, that neither Jew nor Heathen could be justified by works; and the Epistle to the Galatians more particularly, that the Jew cannot be justified by his works, which he performs as a Jew; but this can make no difference as to the proposition, that Justification is gratuitous. Both Epiftles must, of course, by the circumftances in which they were written, have the first justification principally in view: but, if our works

e Art. 1x. Sect. xx1x.—See also Taylor's Key, p. 45, bottom.

d Art. v11. Sect. 111. When Luther is called an Anti-

works fall short of perfection, the same reasoning is applicable to final justification. The general form of the argument is this; Men are sinners, therefore cannot be accounted just, without an act

of mercy in the Judge of the World.

xxvII. Is not our doctrine contrary to that of St. James? who fays, " can faith fave him?"-no; the most that can be allowed is, that the reasoning of James is intended for different circumstances from that f of Paul; or that it is intended to supply what common fense would always supply, if no evafion of duty was in view. But I doubt whether even so great a difference as that need be allowed between these facred writers. Let us suppose them to confer. — Paul. We are justified by Faith.— James. Will he be justified, who does no good works?—Paul. No, I did not fay that; I have faid, the wicked will be punished.—James. You did not mention works with Faith?—Paul. No; but I plainly meant to address myself to Jews and Heathens, and to declare to them, that, when they had performed what they called good works, their eternal falvation must still depend upon the divine Mercy: to those, who profess to neglect good works, I have faid nothing .- James. Then we agree; or, at least we do not disagree. You say, such works as Jews and Heathens have been found to perform, cannot fave them: I fay, nothing will fave them, if they do not strive to live well g.

Whatever

e James ii. 14.

f Art. 1x. beginning of Sect. xxxv111.

This dialogue relates only to some individuals; but the texts about the sinfulness of men, relate (as under the ninth Article) to men taken collectively. All men were concluded under Sin; therefore, notwithstanding the virtues of some individuals, (who themselves erred and were impersect) Men could only be justified by Faith.

Whatever may be thought of this Dialogue, it feems very probable, that some Christians had taken advantage of Paul's expressions about Faith, to evade their duty, and had pleaded, that Faith was h sufficient to save them. This was a pernicious perversion; Paul might be easily seen to have improvements in virtue chiesly in view.—Therefore James corrects the abuse; and in doing so, artlessly and warmly, runs into some expressions seemingly opposite to those of Paul.

Dr. Taylor fays, that St. Paul speaks of the first justification, and St. James of the last, or final.—
This may be true in k fact; that is, St. Paul speaks of perfons becoming Christians. St. James of perfons already Christians; but I think what they both say might have place in both situations. In both, good works are to be aimed at; in both, good

works are incapable of justifying.

The most striking interference between St. James and our Article is in the use of the expression, "Faith only;" both would say, it signifies 'Faith without works;' but in James ii. 24. it means the Faith, as far as it can be called Faith, of a wicked man; in our Article it means Faith, or an honest principle, at any time, without antecedent works perfectly good. In James, you look forward from Faith, as claiming an unmerited reward; in the Article, backward as having put us where we are: though with a view to see the effect of faith, in both cases.

When Faith is spoken of as producing good works, the disposition of the faithful may be the same, as when

h I think it appears from Augustin de Fide et Operibus, that people did the same in his time.

i Art. 1x. Sect. xxxvIII. beginning.

<sup>\*</sup> One passage in James looks as if he might address an unconverted Jew.—" Thou believest that there is one God."—Though this might be said to a converted Jew.

when it is spoken of as *jnslifying* men; yet it is seen in a somewhat different light: after an honest Christian has accepted Justification, he proceeds to action.—Even St. James seems to use it in this sense, though the persons he argues with had Faith only in a low degree, and of a mean sort; or rather, calling themselves Christians, they took for granted, that they had Faith, because they had consented to be baptized.—St. James's expression is, "though a man say he hath Faith." (ver. 14.).

falvation to Virtue, or good works? as in Matt. xxv.—Rom. ii. 7.—Acts x. 35.?—Yes, all this business of admitting men, by favour, into a religious society, is to purify a people zealous of good works. When our Saviour declared the general judgment, his Dispensation was not ripe for our doctrine: though even then, one who did good, was promised a reward as if he did it to Christ:—but the doctrine of justification by Faith will never supersede plain declarations of rewards and punish-

ments

<sup>1</sup> Paul tells a man, our Lord likes fruit-trees: the man shews the Lord a parcel of vile trees, some cut down, all dead; the Lord takes no pleasure in them:—How could you be so absurd? says James: common-sense might have told you, that Paul meant good bearing trees. You must have some bye-interest to make you do such a foolish thing. With this idea, read James ii. 14, &c. to the end of the chapter. . . Abraham was justified by Faith; but not by Faith that disclaimed asting well. So of Rahab.—St. James seems to mean, by being justified by works, not being justified without works:—he says, "can Faith save him?"—that is, Faith without works; or exclusive of virtue. His subject is not, properly, Faith; but something pretending to be Faith, which excludes virtue. He commends Abraham's Faith, because it was not such as he was speaking of.

m Titus ii. 14.

n In the account of the General Judgment, the scene, or situation of things, is quite different from what it is when Justinication

ments for virtue and vice. Declarations of what we are to do, must always be more wanted than statements of the grounds, on which we are to claim reward after we have done well. The more particular mode of our justification is chiefly to be declared, when men shew vain-glory about their brilliant actions; when they seem to intend to dazzle by noble, great, generous strokes of conduct: when they swell and grow irregular, and neglect internal principle.

Much the same may be said of Rom. ii. 7. It contains a general declaration of what may be called the result of our Theory. Taylor fpeaks of it as declaring our final Justification; which must always be conceived as depending upon our works, while we look forward to it with a view to action; though, when we are actually tried, and so look back upon our conduct, we must acknowledge, that it cannot be the meritorious cause of

our falvation.

As to Acts x. 35. it means no more than that worthy men of every nation will be admitted into

fication by Faith is spoken of. All the world is seen collectively; men of all times: and right conduct is supposed to imply right principles. In teaching Justification by Faith, the situation supposed is, that some particular people have made wrong claims to eternal happiness, which are to be rectified and corrected: this is temporary; if these mistakes are set right, all things return into their old train: and Judgment proceeds upon conduct.

Dr. Taylor speaks of Matt. xxv. as not belonging to Christians in particular. See on Rom. Key, paragraph 178.—God might go on as long as he pleased, saying, Virtue shall be rewarded, without mentioning why, or how:—there is no contradiction in

revealing more particulars.

This subject will be more fully treated under Art. x11. in answer to the last objection. Sect. xxv.—Bp. Warburton has something on Matt. xxv. in the ninth book of his Divine Legation: Works, Vol. 3. quarto. p. 697.

o Key, p. 125.

into Christianity:—as Bishop Sherlock has fully shewn.

Is not the doctrine of Justification by XXIX. Faith remote from our common notions of things? and on that account disadvantageous to Virtue? and even to Revelation, by prejudicing men of philosophical minds against it? No; our Doctrine is not at variance with common life; for it is exemplified in different forts of institutions. If we were to take, for instance, military institutions; Faith, or the right disposition, would be a military spirit, with a sense of honour: unformed men are admitted, get into a course of discipline and improvement; become heroes; and though imperfect, get rewarded, through favour; having exerted their military spirit in a series of gallant atchievements. -They can, at no time, claim admission or reward as a strict right; but must always be endeavouring to deserve it. They would, at any time, be laughed at if they faid, that their having been inlifted was a reason why they should be idle or diforderly.—And a man might be favoured by his Sovereign, if patronized by an Officer of merit, especially one intimately connected with the Sovereign .- And fo in other Institutions.

Neither is our doctrine unfavourable to Virtue. Nothing can promote virtue more than right difposition and sentiment in the Heart; or than entering into good institutions and associations: any-

thing

P Vol. 1. Difc. 12.

Indeed actions are only virtuous as they arise from virtuous principles. A man, who gives alms to the poor only from fear, or from ostentation, is not charitable. What Mr. Erskine mentioned as a maxim, in pleading about Juries and Libels, may, by a parity of reasoning, be applied to our purpose; the maxim, Actus non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea, cannot be more just than, Actus non facit bonum, vel pium, nisi mens sit bona, vel pia.

thing may have a few bad effects incidentally, but good inftitutions are likely to be useful to virtue upon the whole.—Indeed we have no right to interpret Scripture but with a view to the circumstances, for which each passage was intended; that is, with a practical view; so as to promote humility on a review of our past conduct, without remissiness as to our future exertions.—Can a real philosopher object to anything planned in such a manner?—Besides, it has before been observed, that, when it is said, Virtue cannot justify us, it is supposed, that we have exerted ourselves to the utmost.

xxx. I will not propose more objections, but proceed to our Application.—And first our Article

of natural religion.

'So imperfect are our virtues, that it is in vain to think of claiming rewards as a debt, on a footing of Justice. I will strive and hope to attain them; but if I am so happy, I will acknowledge them as given, in mercy. My most important business here is, to acquire, by the help of God, an honest principle; with that to enter upon plans and associations for promoting religious and moral improvement. And afterwards constantly to improve and purify my principle, and make it the source of Virtue.— This must be the most salutary method of proceeding; this must afford the greatest ease and security to my mind.'

xxx1. A Christian might fay thus;

'I must aim to do my best, and I may hope, in some way, to attain happiness; but, whenever I conceive myself on my Trial, either for admission into Christianity here, or for final bliss hereaster, Scripture assures me, that I can make no claim on a sooting of strict right. I may be saved; but, if I

am, I must ascribe my Salvation to God, through the Merit of his Son. No more is left for me, than to accept the bounty, with such a disposition as will make me exert all my powers to act well in suture. I adopt this method cordially, as one best adapted to make my principles uniformly good, and give me reasonable hopes of eternal happiness.'

xxxII. Mutual concessions need not here take up

much time.

To Romanists we might make our Article more acceptable by softening some expressions seemingly tending to Antinomianism, and by strengthening expressions tending to encourage Virtue, and the hopes of its rewards.

To Socinians it might perhaps be less exceptionable if we used 'as Christians,' instead of, for the merit of Christ; or interwove some scriptural ex-

pressions.

From Romanists we might expect a concession, that actions can only be good when performed on good principles: and we might wish them to be attentive to the difference between ideal and actual, when speaking of perfection and imperfection; and to own, that we mean to adopt no System but that, which best promotes Virtue.

From Socinians we might expect, that, as we agree in ascribing Salvation to Divine Mercy, they would indulge us in professing something indistinct about the methods of that mercy, and the means

which it chuses to employ.

XXXIII. The principal improvement here, must consist in investigating the real intention of St. Paul and other facred writers, when they introduce any mention of justification: this will include the circumstances and notions of the persons addressed.

I should

I should apprehend, that, when writers treat of Divine Justice and Mercy, they scarcely attend enough to the manner, in which the human mind acquires its more particular ideas of the Nature and Attributes of God. How it begins from Man, according to what was explained in the Introduction prefixed to the ninth Article.

s Sect. vIII.



## APPENDIX

## TO THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE.

## ON THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

HY the Doctrine of Atonement is made a separate subject, will best appear when we have treated of it.—I will begin, as in each entire Article, with some historical remarks: taking first a short historical view of the whole sub-

ject; and then selecting out a few æras.

A short account a may be the following: Before the Reformation, this Doctrine was left to arise naturally from Scripture, as occasion required: at the Reformation, it began to be made a means of depreciating the merit of Popish good works, as was the whole doctrine of Justification by Faith: on this account the Romanists made what oppofition to it they could, confistently with their notions of the Mass, which supposes the Death of Christ to have been a real facrifice. They misrepresented it perhaps sometimes; but they were the occasion of its becoming more definite, by charging the reformed with bad consequences arising from it; or from what they conceived it to be: which naturally brought on explanations and arguments in its defence.—During the time when all men were fet on thinking for themselves, by the Reformation,

<sup>\*</sup> Barnabas makes the Sacrifices of Judaism to be types of the Christian facrifice,—See his Epistle, Sect. 7, 8.

the Socinians arose: and their general principle being, to reduce all things to the level of common sense; to throw out of religion every thing strange b and extraordinary, they have been constantly endeavouring to give all those texts of Scripture, on which we found the very wonderful Doctrine of Atonement, an ordinary confiruction; and to prove, that Repentance is all that is necessary for the remisfion of fins; and that the Death of Christ was not properly a Sacrifice, but only what he fuffered in order to give men fuch an Example, and fuch a *Proof* of his Mission, as could not be given by a common departure out of Life.-The Socinians have not kept precifely and invariably the fame notions, from their rife to the present time; but this may fuffice for a general account of them; in opposing them, some particular solutions have been hazarded, which the most rational and enlightened of the present age have discountenanced; so as greatly to fimplify the Doctrine of Atonement; and leave the redemption of Mankind, through Christ, as a scheme of Divine Wisdom to be accepted by man, rather than understood in its particulars.

mention, at least, a few particular aras. That the Heathens had facrifices, is well known; Dr. Balguy, in his preface to his Father's tract on Redemption, maintains, that they were always feasts or entertainments given to the Gods: and Dr. Priestley, in his History of the corruptions of Christianity, maintains the same. Archbishop Potter (Vol. 1. p. 210). Shews, that the Heathens had

b Dr. Priestley's words might be their motto; "Let us not then look for mysteries where no mystery is, and obscure the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel, &c."—11th Letter to Dr. Price, (p. 157.)

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. 11. 287

had expiatory facrifices, or reconciliatory; but angry Beings may fometimes be appealed by a good Feaft.

The Fews had facrifices, by divine appointment: fin-offerings, or trespass-offerings, of the expiatory kind; peace-offerings for benefits, received or ex-We may add the paschal sacrifice, a settled commemoration. I feel a doubt about admitting all these to be Feasts, as so much stress is laid upon the blood: (Lev. xvii. 11.—Heb. ix. 22).—the shedding of which would be quite an accident, if animals were killed merely to prepare them to be offered. An animal killed for food and not used, would be a prefent equally valuable. Some indeed were allowed to offer fomething inanimate; but this feems to have been a case of necessity. With respect to Christians, in the present subject, the age of the Pelagian controverfy may be joined to those before it; and we may remark of them jointly, as before of the earlier ages, that writers express themselves artlessly, without any view to controversy, or syftem; that occasionally, they extol either the efficacy of Faith in Christ's Death, or of Repentance and virtuous conduct: infomuch that both the defenders and the oppofers of the Doctrine of Atonement, may find passages in them to their purpose; just as they may in the Scriptures themselves .-Any expression was taken, in the times now meant, which feemed most natural; as facrifice, ransom, price, &c. even satisfying the divine Justice occurs amongst the ancients as a thought, topic, illustration; though it was not occupied, as it were, by the public, and fo made what we should call a The refemblance, or notion, of redeeming or ransoming, has been carried so far, as to make the

· Prieftley's Hift. Corr. 1. 249.

the ransom to be spoken of as paid to him, who held man in bondage, that is, to Satan.—We have moreover, amongst the ancients, some marks of diffidence d concerning some points; these shew, that the difficulty of the Doctrine of Atonement was acknowledged; and that men were fincere in what

they did profess.

Instead of quoting authorities, I will refer to the Catholicus consensus prefixed to the Corpus, &c. Confessionume; to our Homilies; to Nicholls on the Article as before, and to Wall on Infant Baptism g. -We must not expect that particularity in the ancients, which we find in the moderns; the ancients were as particular as was needful in their case; and it would be unreasonable to conclude, that they were not in possession of a doctrine because they had not examined it very minutely: As unreasonable, as to conclude, that a man was not in possession of a plant, because he had not examined it with a microscope.—Dr. Priestley, in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity, brings some authorities against the opinion, that the Fathers were in possession of the Doctrine of Atonement; let them be weighed against those to which I refer; to my judgment it feems, that the balance would turn in our favour. He takes into that doctrine some particulars, which are not now maintained by our ablest writers.

He observes, that our doctrine is not "in any ancient summary h of Christian Doctrine."-We might observe, that Christian remission of sins is in the Creeds; which can scarcely be expressed in more

words,

d Hieron. ad Pammachium et Oceanum de erroribus Origenis; quoted in Warb. Div. Leg. B. 9. Introd. f On Salvation, 2d Part.

c Geneva, 1612.

g Chap. 19. Sect. 9, & 12. h Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 221.

words, without introducing some scriptural expression to our purpose; but it is enough to answer, there was no need of more particulars in short confessions of Faith: Doctrines are introduced into Creeds only when wanted ; and every doctrine of every Creed has something human in it: a Creed is an human composition, for purposes of convenience, which are subject to

the judgment of Man.

If larger confessions of Faith are to be blamed for having doctrines not found in the smaller; why may not the fmaller be blamed for having more than is contained in a doxology, or in the short confession used at Baptism in primitive times? Dr. Priestley does indeed fay , that our doctrine was wanted; it might have been opposed to the Doceta, who denied the reality of the Body of Christ, and therefore, in some sense, of his Death. But I believe, they would have maintained, that fomething took place when Christ apparently died, which answered all the purposes of death. And it does not feem fo natural for those who opposed the Docetæ, to dwell on a doctrine, certainly very difficult, which had not been particularly discussed, as to have recourse to topics concerning the Incarnation, which had been more fully debated.

This kind of reasoning on Dr. Priestley's work might be extended far beyond our limits:—I will only observe farther upon it, that I hold it unsair to take every commendation of good works, or of repentance, as an argument against the Doctrine of

Faith

i See Corpus, &c. Confessionum, on the Apostles Creed.

k Art. v 111. Sect. 1.

Page 226.

M See Catholicus Confensus, p. 125, column 2, whence it appears, that the doctrine was held by Tertullian and Irenæus, though not analyzed.

290 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. III. V.

Faith in the merits of the Death of Christ. Those who hold the Doctrine of Atonement, imagine that they feel as warmly the beauty and excellence of virtue, as either Romanists or Socinians.

go beyond others, in the orthodox doctrine, than to differ from them. They commonly used those names for the different sorts of Causes, which have since been found convenient; according to which Christ is called the meritorious cause of our Salvation. We have before referred to a few specimens.

IV. Some have conceived merit, not only in the Death of Christ, but in that of the Martyrso: -they thought perhaps, they were only using a just or laudable parity of reasoning; but we have no right to conclude by analogy from a fingular case; we know too little of the counsels of God, with regard to that stupendous event the death of his Son, to determine, that any other event is of like nature with it. Besides, the expressions of fcripture are against our putting any man on the same footing with the Son of God; as will be shewn hereafter. Nevertheless we may remark, that, whoever made the Death of the Martyrs meritorious, must have pre-supposed the Death of Christ to have been such: their notion was an extension of our Doctrine of Atonement.

v. But the æra of the Reformation is the principal. The Reformed p churches at that time, as now, had different Confessions of Faith; but they are easily compared by means of the harmony prefixed

n Art. x 1. Sect. v.

<sup>•</sup> See Fulke's Rhemish Test. Index Martyrs. (on Col. i. 24) Also Dr. Priestley's Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 229.

P The order here would be better thus; Age of Reformation, Romanists,—Reformed churches in general; England in particular.—Original Socinians.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. VI. 291

fixed to the Corpus before mentioned. I have compared nearly all of them, and find myself most pleased with the two presented to the Emperor Charles V.; the Augustan, and the Argentinensis; but, what is more to the purpose, they differ in nothing which seems essential, as to the Doctrine of Faith in the merits of Christ; only in some sancies, as it were, or hypotheses; as about the scene of Christ's sufferings, about their being judicial, &c.—So good reason had Bishop Warburton for calling our present doctrine the great Gospelprinciple of Protestantism; at the time we are

speaking of.

We should here take notice, not only of the opinions of the reformed, but of those of the Romanists: they are chiefly to be had from the acts The fixth fession conof the Council of Trent. tains some Canons about Justification, as we have already feen; but I do not perceive, that any of them mention the facrifice of the death of Christ. The tenth Canon affirms, that men cannot be justified without the Justitia, Sixarooven, righteousness, of Christ, "per quam nobis meruit;" and adds, that we do not become formally righteous by the righteousness of Christ:—But the Canons of the twenty-second Session, about the Mass, acknowledge, not only the merits and righteoufness of Christ, but the Sacrifice of his Death upon the Cross: as do also the Decrees preceding the Canons:—but I do not fee anything in the expressions very remarkable.

Dr. Nicholls, on this Article, refers to a Book', which I have not feen; and concludes from it,

that

<sup>4</sup> Argentoratum feems to have been a District; Argentina, the capital city of Alsatia.

On the Holy Spirit, p. 326.
Sie Sacerd. Rom. Ven. 1575.

that the Offices of Baptism and Visitation of the fick had once, in the Romish Church, some expressions about the merit of Christ, which have been fince expunged. As to the merit of Christ as affecting Christians, the Romanists seem to have held, and probably hold flill, that, though we are not formally righteous, yet we deferve Salvation by the merit of Christ, that is, they are against imputed righteousness, but for imputed merit. This is expressed briefly in the Rhemish Testament, on Col. "We are not only by acceptation or imputation partakers of Christes benefits, but are by his Grace made worthy thereof, and deferve our Salvation condignely." On the 24th verse of the fame chapter, Protestants are represented as, "under pretence of Christes passion," taking "away the valure of all good deedes." - See also on Rom. viii. 18.

The church of England held, at the time of the Reformation, the same doctrine, which it holds now; though perhaps that doctrine had not then been considered so particularly, as it has been since. I will read to you, in confirmation of this opinion, a few passages out of the Article of Justification in the Necessary Doctrine, and out of some of our first Homilies, especially that on the Misery of Mankind.

vii. The Puritans' wished Reformation to be carried farther than it was; and so opposed Popish doctrines very strenuously. Their writings, as I remember, express the efficacy of the death of Christ forcibly.—But I'refer to Ludlam's Essay on the doctrine of Satisfaction, p. 67.

viii. Faustus Socinus thought a, that Christ had fuch interest in Heaven, that he could get his disciples

Art. x1. Sect. x11.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Priestley, Hist. Cor. 1. 273.

disciples freed from punishment. He considered Redemption as deliverance from the guilt of Sin, by good Laws and precepts, tending to reform us.— The Racovian Catechism supplies us with the arguments of the early Socinians, in the chapter de Morte Christi. The death of Christ, we are told, was chiefly for the sake of his Resurrection; our orthodox opinion, "fallax est et erronea et admodum perniciosa". Some theory is given of the divine Justice and Mercy, but, in general, the same arguments are used there, which have been since used by the modern Socinians, though no notice is now taken of their being old.

Against Socinus, Grotius published his work, called, Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi, to which Vossius writes a short Preface, telling us, that Grotius was the first, who had written on the subject, so as to make it his proper business: yet the doctrine is called Catholic in the title. Vossius speaks of Grotius as having been induced to write, by Socinus's having held errors vetustati minus notos, and by his having gone upon general principles of morality. The work is reckoned, I think, worthy of Grotius, though not perhaps defensible in every particular: it seems in some respects an instance of the orthodox having

taken ground untenable.

The Family of Love make the shedding of Christ's blood to mean, the shedding of the Spirit in the hearts of the faithful<sup>2</sup>.

Bishop Butler, in his Analogy, has been of great fervice

Rogers on the Article.

A short account of the contents see in Apthorp's Lestures on Prophecy, Vol. 2. p. 73.

fervice in shewing, that our doctrine is not liable to any solid objection. Bishop Warburton has ably defended it, by shewing, that the command given to Abraham to sacrifice his son implied a proper sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind. Mr. John Balguy, father of the justly celebrated Dr. Thomas Balguy, has published a treatise to prove, that the Justerings of Christ should be reckoned as merits, and that God gave the Salvation of mankind to his Son as a reward of those merits.—Dr. Thomas Balguy has republished this tract, with a preface of his own, which is, like every other thing of his, well worth considering: the reader will see, that he calls himself an advocate rather than a judge.

Dr. Taylor, in his book on the Epistle to the Romans, looks upon the Blood of Christ as meaning his obedience and goodness; and upon the worth of Christ's death, as being of a moral kind:—See his Key, Chap. viii. and his Note upon Rom.

111. 25.

This is not faying, that Christ died only for an example; and for confirmation of his mission; (though he uses the words pattern and confirmation, page 269.) nor is it holding, that God's natural placability will make him always accept of Repentance. Though, therefore, we have called Taylor a Socinian under the ninth Article, he does not seem to agree with the modern Socinians on our present subject.

Locke is said by Michaelis (Introd. Lect. Sect. 133, end,) to have been prejudiced against the doctrine of the Atonement: but he seems by no means a Socinian: what he objects to (Note on

b End of Address to the Reader.

a Div. Leg. B. v1. Sect. v. Confult also Book 1x. which proves the Sacrifice of Christ to be real.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. IX. 295

Rom. iii. 24.) is rather the doctrine of Satisfaction, or the notion that in Redemption by Christ an

equivalent is firictly paid.

Mr. Hervey, the pious and eloquent writer of the Meditations, has written a discussion, in the way of Dialogue, on the subject of Atonement; the characters who debate are called Theron and Aspasso: in this, he runs into more particulars concerning the manner, in which God is induced to forgive men for the fake of the fufferings of Chrift, than feem, to some judgments, within the reach of human comprehension. On this account, he has been attacked, in a formidable manner, by Mr. Wm. Ludlam, the celebrated mathematician and mechanic.—By reading Mr. Ludlam's Effay, a thinking a man may be led to reflect on the fubject, in a proper manner. His friends Dr. Powell', Dr. Balguy d, and also Dr. Ogdene, seem to be of the fame opinion with himself; we are only to hold, they think, that the sufferings and Death of Christ are a medium, through which God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, is pleased to confer forgiveness of fins on the race of man; but they conceive, that it is not for us to examine minutely into the particular way, in which this plan appears to the divine mind: it is not our business to carry our opinions farther than Scripture and experience authorize; or to form any notions, but fuch as refult immediately from comparing the word of And I am mistaken if this God with his works. does not, in a little time, prove the fettled opinion of improved and enlightened Christians.

I conclude these historical remarks with observing, that the *Moravians* dwell almost constantly, in their Sermons and Hymns, on the sufferings of

Christ:

Second Sermon on the Articles of Faith.

In his last Charge. d Page 200, 201.

Christ: and that some of those called Methodists have said such bold things of the efficacy of the Christian sacrifice, as to occasion some danger to good works. Yet I believe this danger to be in a decreasing state: some who have written with great calmness and rational argument against Socinians, on the subject of Atonement, have been considered as, at some time, attached to Mr. Wesley. Writers who use the bold expressions here meant, may be called Antinomians, to whatever sect they belong: the examination of Dr. Crispe's Sermon would afford us instances of a continued language, referring all spiritual excellence and advantage to Christ.

Justification, which is written with ability, and could scarce fail to improve any attentive reader.

x. Having finished our History, we come next to the Explanation of some terms, which are commonly used in speaking of the efficacy of the death of Christ (sometimes including his sufferings and his virtues) on the Salvation of Mankind.

x1. Let us first take the word Atonement, as that is now made a principal term, and the name of the whole doctrine, in which we differ from the Socinians as to our present subject. The meaning of it seems to be, an act which God is pleased to accept in lieu of punishment; when an Atonement is made, God is supposed to view the person, on whose account it is made, in the light of an offender, and to be appeased by the act, as a magistrate is by some fine or imposition, when he forbears to execute the rigour of the law.

Dr.

s Mentioned Art. x1. Sect. x.

f See Letter to Mr. B—e from Academicus, p. 56. 58, and 61, &c.

Dr. Prieftley h fays, that Atonement means making any person or thing clean, so as to be fit for divine worship: and that does seem to be its particular meaning in feveral places; infomuch that, in the LXX, we fometimes find xalagizo and ayia Co, when we find making atonement in the English; but, under the Jewish law, a perfon might appear in the light of an offender on account of uncleanness; and, though he had committed no very diftinguished sin, he might, if he was going to perform any religious fervice that required particular purity, make an atonement for his general imperfection: which notion agrees well with the prayer of David, "Who can tell how oft he offendeth? O cleanse thou me from my secret faults!" -I do not fee how cleanfing, as the primitive sense of making Atonement, can agree with εξιλασxouas, which is the word most commonly used for making an Atonement, and which has no relation to uncleanness, except as an offence. This Author affirms too, that "Guilt, in a moral fense, is never faid to be atoned for by any facrifice:"-but we read of Sin-offering, and Atonement for 1 Sin; and, not to examine particulars, we read that the annual Atonement was made for "the errors of the people." The word is αγνοηματων, which contains an idea of finning through ignorance; and may mean, the offences of persons not hardened, or void of good principles: but those are the Sins, which are supposed to be pardoned even on the Christian scheme as well as the Jewish: Sacrifice does not, in any religion, take away all punishment whatfoever: those, who are truly penitent for past fins, are put upon a footing with those, who

h Hist. Cor. 1. 193,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Exod. xxix. 36, 37. k Pf. xix. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vii. 27. with marginal references.

See also Heb. ix. 7. and compare Heb. v. 3. with Lev. ix. 7.

have finned inadvertently: they are not void of good principles. Under the Mosaic religion, where every thing was connected with divine worship, fins struck men most in the light of rendering offenders unsit for divine worship;—" the Priest shall make an Atonement for you to cleanse you"—from what?—" that ye may be clean from all your Sins before the Lord." This idea of sin cannot be equally strong under the Christian dispensation; and we may see, that it is not, on a comparison between Judaism and Christianity, if we read the concluding verses of the ninth Chapter to the Hebrews, and a sew of the first verses in the tenth.

Atonement occurs only once in our English New Testament; Rom. v. 11. where, as Dr. Priestley rightly observes, it might have been reconciliation, the Greek word being καταλλαγη. Indeed I am, at present, at a loss to see what could lead our translators to the word "Atonement," in this place, as reconciling had repeatedly occurred in the preceding verse. Though I believe the translators knew more of the matter than I do, or than Dr. Priestley does.

x11. The next term which occurs, is Propitiation: it occurs only twice, in Rom iii. 25. and I John ii. 2. In the former place, the original is λας ηριου, in the latter, λασμος.— Ίλασμος feems to require no particular confideration; it fignifies that person or thing which appeases, or renders propitious; that Christ is such a person, it belongs to our proof to shew; the meaning of such a definition, whether the proposition implied in it be true or false, is no way obscure.

But we shall scarcely have an adequate idea of inarneson, without looking into the Old Testa-

ment:

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XIV. 299 ment: the word is properly an adjective, used as a substantive, by having one understood; exidenz is that fubstantive: The LXX use the expression" ιλας πριου επιθεμα; and the Hebrew has DDD, from to cover, for the same thing, taking the name rather from emileua, which in Greek is sometimes left out. The thing referred to, is called the Mercy-feat; the nature of which will be best feen in Exod. xxv. 17. 22.—and in agnetor is rendered Mercy-feat, Heb. ix. 5. - It does not feem to have been the Lid of the Ark, but a plate of pure gold laid loofe upon the lid, which was also of pure gold. (In Exod. xxv. compare ver. 11. & 17.)-Both Locke's and Taylor's Notes on Rom. iii. 25. deserve to be read: and the way to understand how Christ is a Propitiation in this sense, is, to consider the purposes of the Mercy-seat, the DDD, the idas notor, in the fanctum fanctorum, under the Mosaic dispensation; and then to think how our bleffed Lord answers all similar purposes p under the Christian.

We see, that Propitiation and Atonement are nearly connected: iλασχομαι comprehends them both.

Atonement or Propitiation; and is sufficiently clear when men are considered in the light of offenders; or, under Christianity, as children of wrath, or concluded under Sin. Or as enemies, Rom. v. 10.

xiv. We have already had occasion to speak of Sacrifice: Oblation, or offering, seems only a more comprehensive term, including every thing presented to any Deity.—We shall have occasion to speak

P This is well expressed in Taylor's Note on Rom. iii. 25.

n Exod. xxv. 17.

<sup>•</sup> See an engraving opposite to the title-page of Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon; where other passages are referred to.

300 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XV.

ipeak hereafter of the difference between proper and figurative facrifices. We may observe here, that, in every proper facrifice, blood is supposed to be shed; or Life taken away. Sacrifico does not imply that in its etymology, only to perform facred rites, and to do facrifice xat' exoxnu; but Duw in Greek, and not in Hebrew, signify to kill, in general, as well as to facrifice: which of these two is the primary signification, is not of importance in

our present business.9

xv. We frequently meet with mention of vicarious suffering and punishment; or punishment by fubstitute; which may be intelligible without explanation: but, as I have asked myself whether I faw clearly what it meant, I may mention it to others. If a man fold himself to flavery, in order to fet another at liberty, (his Benefactor, suppose, or his Prince, or Parent), his sufferings, as a flave, would be vicarious.—If a deferter was going to be fcourged, and another foldier (his brother, or friend,) offered to be scourged for him, and the offer was accepted, his punishment would be vicarious.—But a person may prevent the punishment of another, and even by suffering, and yet that fuffering not be vicarious.—Suppose the Deferter's brother had, by getting maimed, and receiving wounds never perfectly curable, faved a citadel, or the life of a Commander, and was to folicit for a remission of the Deserter's punishment, urging, that he wanted no gold or filver for his patt fervices, but only that his brother should that once escape pain; if his petition was granted, he would relieve another, and, in a good measure, by

<sup>9</sup> Luke ii. 24. The offering of the Birds is called a Sacrifice, Sugiar, but that was in lieu of a Lamb, as appears from Lev. xii. 8. and Reland fays (Ant. 3. 1. 1.) the Jews do not allow to be applicable to Birds. In such a case, the sense of Sugia might be extended.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART.XI. SECT.XVIII. 301

his fufferings; but yet he could not be faid to fuffer vicarious evil, or punishment: his brother's escape might be conceived as owing to his merits,

or to be given him as a reward.

XVI. Punishment is evil inflicted by authority, in consequence of an offencer. But any evil is called a punishment in some views; because evil often operates as punishment, in deterring from bad conduct. But evil feems to be called punishment especially if it arises from any faulty conduct; -deli-

rant Reges, plectuntur Achivi.

XVII. Redemption is buying anything back again: it is also delivering from confinement, generally from flavery or captivity, by payment of fomething valuable, to him who holds in bondage the person redeemed. That which is paid is called a Ransom, in Greek Auteov.—Redemption seems to be primarily used (as far as respects the matter before us) for rescuing the Israelites from Ægyptian bondage; and afterwards it is applied to refcuing Christians from the bondage of Idolatry. Deity redeems without actually and literally paying a ranfom; God is always faid to use any human means, when', if Man had accomplished the fame end, it would have been by those means.— And thus the Deity may purchase as well as redeem.

XVIII. Salvation may be mentioned, though it does not perhaps very frequently occur in difputes about the doctrine of Atonement. Saving feems to imply evil or danger, from which a person is made fafe. The Ifraelites were faved' from the Ægyptians; and, in like manner, Christians are faved from the evils of Heathenism, and from its ipiritual

See Ludlam's 2d Essay, p. 25.
Introd. to 2d Part of Articles, Sect. v 111.
Taylor on Romans, Index, Saved.

302 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XIX.

fpiritual dangers. In the times of Christ and his Apostles, men were said to be saved, who were converted to Christianity, as has been observed before "; and "eternal" salvation" may be understood to mean, securing from eternal evils, or giving a security, which shall continue for ever. "Eternal" redemption," bears a like sense. Both phrases, being in the Epistle to the Hebrews, have a reference to

the History of the Fews.

x1x. A term much in use in discussions about the Atonement, is fatisfaction. It feems fometimes to mislead; let us reslect on what passes in our minds, and perhaps we may perceive how -Although we acquire our ideas of the qualities of God by afcribing to him human qualities, enlarged and purified, yet we may fometimes be mifled by words and founds: we may ascribe qualities to him without properly enlarging them, or duly clearing them from imperfections. The doctrine of Satisfaction implies, that God must execute Justice; so we call inflicting punishment. God has faid, "Thou shalt not steal:"—a man steals; his punishment, we say, and truly, is just-justice is a good quality, therefore a perfect Deity has it for an attribute: therefore the offender must be punished. No refource? why, yes; a corporal punishment may be changed into a Fine; and A may bear the fine, which B has incurred: why not even a perfonal punishment?—Whichever is punished, the heinousness of the crime is published, and the terrors of Justice displayed; all men, even B himself, may abstain from stealing in future, as carefully as if B had fuffered: in fhort, a man may be punished by substitute, and then Justice will be satisfied; satisfaction will be made, there will be an

\* Heb. v. 9. Y Heb. ix. 12.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Art. x. Sect. xxix. and Art. x1. Sect. xiv.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XIX. 303 an Atonement to appeale the Divine wrath. Thus are some men's thoughts apt to run on; and thus is the Doctrine of Satisfaction established; but, I think, some expressions in the train are taken as meaning more than they really do mean. This step is not enough attended to: "his punishment is just;" it really means no more than that it would not be unjust, if it was to be inflicted; the offender would have no reason to complain; but, because it is not unjust, is it therefore necessary? not necessary to be inflicted by the Deity, that we know of; an human Magistrate may be guilty of some fort of injustice by letting offenders escape; but he would not be called unjust to the offenders; his injustice would be against the public, or the profecutor, who are under his protection.-Then, the expression, " Justice is a good quality," is capable of misleading: it is certainly good to infringe no man's rights; and in Governors and Magistrates it is good to refift corruption and partiality, and do nothing from private interest or favour: It is good to act with fleadiness and fortitude, though threatened by combinations of wicked men; to be uniform in executing laws, though after a long interval: but, though justice is good in all these views, it does not follow, that an all-wife judge must necessarily inflict punishment on every offender for every offence. We cannot speak of Justice fo abstractedly, as to say universally, Justice must be fatisfied; though in some situations, and with some views, the expression, 'Justice shall be fatisfied,' may not be improper: as when it means, that, notwithstanding some particular escapes, punishment still may be expected by all who offend.— Indeed, nothing now faid, in order to shew that men are misled by sounds about Satisfaction, ought to afford any encouragement to any offender; VOL. III.

when punishment is only not unjust, he has reason to expect and to dread it: and he will certainly feel it, as far as infinite wisdom directs that he should: whilst we stand in the light of men liable to punishment, we should be careful not to reason ourselves out of an apprehension of just punishment; though, in studying the divine nature, we should be equally careful not to tie up the administration of the Governor of the world, by the imperfection of our human language; by fancying a proposition universally true, when it is but true If it feems good to in certain circumstances. the Deity, he may accept of Atonements of very different kinds, and for very different forts of offences.

The word fatisfaction is twice used in Numb. xxxv. namely, in verses 31. & 32. in the sense of which we are now speaking, or in one very near it:

the Greek word is AUTPa 2.

xx. The doctrine of satisfaction, the notion of satisfying divine Justice, conceived to be under the necessity of punishing rigorously the sins of mankind, brings on what appears to me a still more difficult doctrine; I mean that of Imputation of sin to Christ. If God must punish because he is just, he can only punish guilt; Christ is to be punished for the sins of the whole world; therefore he must be guilty of them: yet he was perfectly innocent; he was the Lamb without a spot; he did no sin," he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." How are these things to be reconciled?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Bp. Warburton fays, Satisfaction "carries in it the ideas of a debt paid and accepted;" i. e. unites the ideas of Redemption and Justification. Div. Leg. B. 9. Vol. 3. p. 684, quarto.—In this fense it may be useful sometimes, if not perverted.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. i. 19.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 22.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. i. 19. <sup>c</sup> Heb. iv. 15.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXI. 305

ciled? by a word d; Christ is to have real guilt, but not inherent, only imputed. In truth, when one comes to examine this matter of imputed guilt, it seems to be merely nominal. It is a something wholly inconceivable, and only spoken of in order to keep the Theory of satisfying divine Justice intire and compact: though, as far as I can judge, that theory which cannot be supported without terms, out of which all meaning must be thrown,

should answer some useful purpose.

I will not trouble you with any farther Explanation: indeed some of the terms now explained are not in our eleventh Article; but, if they are in any of the others, or in our Liturgy, or Homilies, that is enough. The doctrine of Atonement is both introduced into the fecond Article and the thirty first; but, as the former treats of the Incarnation, and the latter of the Majs, I would not enter upon that doctrine under either of them, nor anywhere but here; and therefore I would explain here any terms, which they may contain. In our communion-office, the prayer of confecration contains feveral of our terms; but I look upon the number as intended (not as in a law-deed, to bind and confine, but) to give scope and liberty to the mind: and also to guard against the doctrine of the continual facrifice of the Mass.

XXI. We come now to our *Proof*: but what is it which is to be proved? my idea is this; we all

fal

4 "Thus we find perfect innocence and real guilt united in

Christ." Ludlam on Satisfaction, p. 105.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>e</sup> B. 111. Chap. x. Sect. v1.—Imputed rigteousness is mentioned Art. x1. Sect. xv. The theory is, good Christians have imputed righteousness, though not inherent: yet imputed righteousness is real; and yet we are really guilty: that is, we have inherent guilt. If all this is only to support our popular notion of Satisfaction, it might as well be set aside.

306 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXII.

fall short of doing our duty, therefore the Law, which enjoins it, ferves finally to condemn us; the Christian Religion comes in to our relief; it does not abolish the Law, for that is divine, and adapted to make human nature happy; but it forms us into a Society, so beneficial, that every member is furnished with the means of obtaining eternal happiness after death: his hopes are not to be founded on the improbable supposition, that he will act so, "in all points," as to claim eternal happiness on a footing of Justice: - if he acts from the fundamental principle of the Christian Society, he will be finally happy, notwithstanding he may at times continue to fall short of satisfying the law. is always to confider God, not as acting arbitrarily, but as the rewarder of Virtue and the punisher of Vice; in which character it pleases his infinite wisdom and goodness to give this inestimable privilege to Christians, in a manner periectly gratuitous, with fome view to the fufferings, the conduct, the merit of his Son, who is perpetual head of this Society.

of this statement of the case. It might be some-

thing like this;

xxII. God will make fincere Christians eternally happy, notwithstanding some impersections of theirs, on account of the merits, the sufferings, and the *Death* of Christ.

The number of texts, which may be brought in fupport of this proposition, is extremely great; my wish is, to produce them all; because every addition

Here I first consulted, hastily, the ninth Book of the Divine Legation of Moses: but I had first written, though not correctly, the substance of the remainder of this Appendix.—Whatever references to that Book have already appeared in these papers, were added afterwards.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. X. SECT. XXII. 307

tion to the number must strengthen the proof; and each sacred writer must corroborate the testimony of the others; but I fear you will have already thought me somewhat prolix:—on the whole, I will confine myself to a felection; in making which, we must keep in mind what has been already quoted under the eleventh Article.

Confult If. h liii. 4-6.

Matt. xx. 28. life a Ranfom for many."

John i. 29.—Behold the Lamb of God.

xv. 13.—Lay down his Life for his friends.

Acts iv. 12.—No other name whereby, &c. and Salvation.

--- xx. 28.—which (Church) he hath purchased with his own blood.

Rom. iii. 23—26. \* —and the sense arising from making draws mean mild, candid; (I scarce know which sense to prefer; but our doctrine stands firm upon either.)

Rom. v. 6-10.—died for—justified by his blood—reconciled.

vi. 23.—eternal Life through Jesus Christ.

1 Cor. i. 30.—who of God (απο θεκ) δικαιοσυνη,
άγιασμος, απολυτρωσις.

- viii. 11. } - for whom Christ died-with Rom. xiv. 15.

2 Cor.

h Here see Pearson on the Creed, p. 74, folio. - Taylor on Romans, Note, on Rom. iii. 25.

It might be better to take more proofs out of St. John's Gospel; as John iii. 14—18.—also ver. 35, 36.—Chap. iv. ver. 42.—Chap. x. ver. 15. 28, 29.

ver. 42.—Chap. x. ver. 15. 28, 29.

k With the note in Short Defence of the Doctrine of Atonement, p. 33.

308 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXIV.

2 Cor. v. 18, 19.—and reconciling.—made him Sin.

Gal. i. 4.—gave himself for our Sins.

Ephef. i. 7.—redemption through his blood.

ii. 16.—reconciled by the Cross.

- iv. 32.—God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you.

1 Tim. ii. 6 —gave himself a ransom for all.

Hebrews entire: but particularly Chap. ix. ver.

26. 28. and Chap. x. 1—14.

1 Pet. i. 2. On this text, I presume to differ from Taylor<sup>1</sup>: I make five distinct things:—1. Christians are fore-known.—2. chosen.—3. fanctified by the spirit at Baptism:—4. walk in virtue.—5. "And" finally are justified by the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

1 Pet. i. 19.—precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb, &c.

I John i. 7.—the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.

Rev. vii. 14.—wash—in the blood of the Lamb. Abraham's facrifice of his son was mentioned in a former part of our system. Here I must close our direct proof; though I do it reluctantly, as every omission prevents our doctrine from being seen in its sull force and extent.

xx111. I now proceed to indirect proof; or to

the folution of some few objections.

open in the Old Testament, or in the Gospels, or in the Asts of the m Apostles.—How it should be expected in the Old Testament, though our doctrine

On Romans, Note before cited, on Rom. iii. 25.
Priestley, Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 154, and following.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXIV. 309

were true, I cannot imagine"; it is shadowed forth by types, and seems to be intimated by Prophecy"; nay, it will be difficult to account for God's appointing Sacrifices amongst the Jews, except we suppose some end in view relative to Christianity; to that dispensation, which was to extend to all mankind. For the Jews, or Israelites, were to be kept as much separated from Idolatry as possible; this was the grand purpose of their existence as a People; was it not very strange, that the principal part of their ritual Religion should be the same with that of Idolaters? on our supposition, this is intelligible; on the Socinian hypothesis, it does not appear so.

With regard to the Gospels and Asts of the Apostles, it cannot be said, that they contain no traces of our doctrine; we have already referred to several passages which contain some: more might be mentioned; for every account of Christian remission of Sins, differs from remission through the mere natural essential placability of the Deity.

But it seems certain to me, as has been before repeatedly observed, that Christianity was intended to be opened gradually; that converts were at first to be treated as "Babes in Christ," and fed with milk; and not with strong a meat till afterwards:—

taking

9 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2. with marginal references.

n Dr. Priestley says, the general principles of our doctrine might be expected to appear in the Old Testament.—Display of Justice, and abhorrence of Sin: are not these in the Old Testament? see Deut. xxxii. 35.—Psalm xxxix. 11.—v. 5. &c. &c. Also Psalm xciv. 1.—But, I see, the Racovian Catechism says, (p 181. De morte Christi) God is not represented as just, but as angry; I hope, at least, His anger is just.

o If liii. 4-6.
P Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 152.—Famil. Illustr. p. 48.—Cat. Racov. p. 180.

taking this thought along with us, we must feel a pleasing admiration at finding, in the Acts of the Apostles, an intermediate degree of distinctness; something between the intimations of the Gospels, and the full declarations of the Epistles.—Of the 25th Chapter of St. Matthew I have faid fomething already'; it is not likely, that the doctrine should be explicitly declared there, or in the Parable of the Prodigal' Son; or in anything delivered before the Death of Christ, the event principally to be dwelt upon; the foundation on which the doctrine was to be built: a sketch might be drawn, but the superstructure could not be built before the foun-The Parable of the Prodigal Son dation was laid. was calculated to obviate the envious prejudices of the Jews, against admitting the Gentiles to unite with them in one common Religion; it was not natural to introduce our doctrine into fuch an Apologue. Nor was it wanted in order to declare, that each man was to expect " mercy in proportion to the mercy he shewed; that might be declared even now without entering into the doctrine of Atonement.—In Eph. iv. 32. we have, " even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you;" which opens an additional motive to forgiveness, but not an effential one: perhaps still more motives to forgiveness may appear hereafter; that would not prove the invalidity of those we now have. Our Saviour's expostulations were chiefly intended to beat down Jewish prejudices by each man's natural feelings and affections; any topic occasioning perplexity would have defeated his purpose.

xxv. Suppose

<sup>\*</sup> Hift. Corr. 1. 160.

Art. x1. Sect. xxv111. this will also be mentioned again, Art. x11. Sect. xxv.

P. S. See Warburton's Works, quarto, Vol. 3. p. 699, bottom.

Hift. Corr. 1. 159.

Hift. Corr. 1. 159.

xxv. Suppose fomething be faid, in the Gofpels, about the merits and death of Christ, yet does not the general tenor \* of the Scriptures shew, that God will pardon "finners freely" "whenever they truly repent and reform their lives?"-In the first place, God will pardon sinners freely, if he pardons them when they cannot claim pardon, as a matter of strict right: he may annex a condition to a pardon, and yet it may still be free: else indeed repentance could not be requisite: it is no more abfurd to freak of a free pardon on account of the merits of Christ, than of a free pardon on condition of repentance. Repentance, I doubt not, always avails something in the fight of God; but can it bring men to the same state in which they would be if they had continued innocent 2? does experience hew this; or rather, is not the Socinian idea of the fufficiency of repentance mere hypothesis? at least, can repentance be supposed to merit or procure an eternity of happiness?—As to the New Testament, I think we may observe, that Repentance is most spoken of before the Gospelscheme gets opened; that, when it is fully opened, there is most said of Faith: the AEts we find here again an intermediate link, where repentance and faith are fometimes joined, fometimes mentioned feparately. Indeed, when one is mentioned, the other is implied: this Mr. Locke has observed; and his observation agrees with some remarks, which

Div. Leg. Book ix. p, 636, 4to. but better in p. 650.

<sup>\*</sup> Hift. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 156 .- 168 .- Famil. Illustr. p. 48.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Dr. Balguy's Pref. p. vi.
<sup>2</sup> Powell's Third Charge, p. 346. mentioned Book 1. Chap. x1x. Sect. x111. Div. Leg. Book ix. rather against this, in some sense.

b Reasonableness of Christianity; Works, Vol. 2. p. 630, 631, quoted by Jon. Edwards in his Sermons, 12°. p. 125.

312 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXVI.

we have made about partial causes, and divine and human agency: so that repentance may avail through Christ, though Christ be not mentioned; and certainly, men may be exhorted to repent, even on a sooting of natural Religion, without any conclusion being rightly drawn against revealed.

xxvi. It is moreover said, supposing Faith in Christ requisite for eternal happiness, as well as repentance, yet do we not make too serious and losty a matter of God's conferring benefits for Christ's sake?—in support of this objection our adversaries erefer to

Gen. xxvi. 24. I will bless thee, &c. for Abraham's sake.

Exod. xxxii. 13. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy servants, &c.

Deut. ix. 27. Remember thy servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, &c.

Nothing very great is implied, say the objectors, in these expressions; why should we entertain so high an idea of similar ones in the New Testament about Christ?—The passages alledged seem to establish the general principle, that God may confer benefits on a number from respect to the merit of one: how high our notions shall be, must depend on the greatness of the person, and the importance of the benefit.

The distinction which Abraham had enjoyed in the fight of God, afforded Moses a good topic in pleading for the Israelites: the better on account of the covenant actually subsisting. I should be unwilling to admit an argument against Faith, taken from the attention paid to the "Father of the

<sup>·</sup> Introduction to Part 11. of Articles, Sect. v111.

Art. x. Sect. xLI. Famil. Illustr. p. 53.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXVII. 313 faithful."-All representations of God's conferring benefits for the fake of Christ, must be inadequate; yet we see the principle in common life.-You do good to the fon of your Benefactor, for his Father's fake: and fometimes a Society receives benefit as fuch: fo that each member is benefited merely because he is a member. If a regiment is honoured, each recruit enlifted into it shares in the honour. It is not therefore difficult to conceive, that the merit of Christ may benefit every member of that fociety, of which he is the

Nor is it necessary, because God forgives mankind "for Christ's sake," that he should never shew any favour to any individual for the sake of worth in some one, on whom that individual depends, or with whom he is connected. The divine goodness shewn to the race of Abraham is no argument against the Redemption of the world by Jesus Christ.

xxv11. Suppose it were right, that we should profess Faith in Christ; yet, when his death is called a facrifice, are we not, fay the Socinians, to confider the expression as figurative, or metaphorical? in the same manner, I suppose, as when the Apostle says, "but to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices h God is well pleased?"

I have confidered this matter, but I own, I dare not

Head.

See a Letter under Art. 1x. from the Duke de Fitzjames to the French Monarch; dated 11th Jan. 1791, about the Irish Regiments having behaved honourably for generations. The Swift were body-guard to the French King, on account of some tervice formerly done.

<sup>8</sup> Famil. Illust. p. 48-Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 182, &c.

h Heb. xiii. ver. 15, 16.

At the time here spoken of, I was not aware of Dr. Ogden's two fermons on the death of Christ, as prefigured by the Jewish facrifices:

214 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXVII. not fay, with " Taylor, that the blood of Christ, means only his obedience and goodness; though, at the same time, I would not affirm, that without the moral part, the blood would have availed. I take the following method: I suppose a teacher to come into the world, with supernatural powers; to be diligent in instructing, to be opposed, and put to death: I suppose, after his death, his followers to represent it in all lights, which could convince and persuade; I can imagine them to preserve some drops of his blood "; but I cannot conceive perfons, in such a situation, to use expressions which would come up to the strength of those found in the New Testament. Would they talk of the shedding of their teacher's blood as facrificial? of its cleanfing the world from all fin? would they find out some slaughters of brute animals, which had been instituted, and carried on for centuries, so as to prepare the world for the death of this one man? to suppose such language, when not grounded on reality, is to give up all good sense in these followers; and it is to suppose pretensions wholly incredible. And if this language could be used of the blood of one man, why not of the blood of others? if there can be anything in the character and rank of one man to give propriety to fuch expressions, will the Socinians allow it to be applied to Jesus? they would have Jesus a mere man, and

facrifices: when I first saw them (after writing on the subject) I was alarmed to perceive, that he had divided those sacrifices in a different manner from mine. However, after reading the Pentateuch with care, my alarm goes off. Dr. Ogden's two sermons are, notwithstanding, excellent.

k On Romans, Key, Chap. viii. Note on Rom. iii. 25.—See

Lev. xvii. 11.

1 Hift. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 172.

m The blood of St. Januarius, the patron Saint of Naples, is preserved in that City, and miraculously liquested once a year.

yet they would suppose expressions to be used concerning him, so as they cannot be, with propriety, concerning the ordinary death of any mere man.

It is urged, that, as some metaphors are used with regard to the death of Christ, we cannot tell when the scripture-language is proper, when metaphorical: this variety may fometimes occasion difficulty: as may appear from our explanation of terms: there is, no doubt, a figurative creation, a figurative resurrection, ascension, &c. but does this prevent our believing, that there has been a real creation and refurrection? we fometimes find God called our Creator, fometimes a rock, or a shield; we know, that the first is not a metaphorical name, and that the others are; it might require many words to mark out the manner, in which the mind makes the distinction, especially in fome nice cases; but, in this case, every one must own, that it is easy to make. Nor does it feem difficult to diftinguish between facrifice in Heb. ix. and facrifice in Heb. xiii. ver. 15, 16.— The latter being metaphorical, and very different from the former, feems to imply, that the former is proper.

In one sense, however, it seems as if there might be some kind of comparison in calling the death of Christ a sacrifice; but, though every metaphor is a comparison, every comparison is not a metaphor. It may be called a sacrifice by way of accommodation and condescension to our conceptions; in the sight of God it may be something, of which we have no idea; the nearest representation to the truth which we can comprehend, may be, that it is a sacrifice; but, if that is the case, it must be deemed, by us, a real sacrifice as far as we understand it; its effects similar to those of a real

facrifice,

316 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXVII. facrifice, though higher than we can fully conceive.

On this account, it cannot be faid, either scriptural expressions must be interpreted figuratively or literally; if literally, they "enforce the belief of proper vicarious punishments," if figuratively, "they will not oblige us to believe the Doctrine of Atonement in any fense:" we must "abandon all middle opinions o: For, if my idea is right, it may be impossible to ascertain the degree, in which the facrifice of the death of Christ is called so in the way of comparison; and therefore middle opinions may be very rational. We may conceive the scriptural expressions neither to be wholly metaphorical; nor yet to be literal in the same degree, as when an ordinary human event is described.

The facrifice of the death of Christ is most fully treated in the Epiftle to the Hebrews; this therefore has had its authority p called into question, though it is fometimes quoted in the fame manner<sup>9</sup> that we quote it, by the same person who at other times depreciates it. - But, when we say a doctrine is scriptural, we mean, that it can be proved by those books, which are now commonly understood to be canonical: and there can be no greater compliment paid to a doctrine, than to shew, that, in order to remove it, you must take away some part of Scripture. It has been fufficiently shewn, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did confider the death of Christ as a real sacrifice, and Christ as a real Priest'.

If the death of Christ was a real sacrifice, was it fin-offering, or peace-offering, or what? there seems

<sup>•</sup> Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 277, 278.

Short Defence, p. 10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 15. and partic. 16.-Hift. Corr. 1. 184.

to be no necessity, that it should correspond precifely to any one fort; it might be prefigured by them all, and so correspond to them all, in one refpect or other; as Bishop Cleaver' observes that the Sacrament does, which was instituted as a commemoration of it.—It might be a fin-offering, as atoning for the fins of the Christian church; it might be a peace-offering, as supplicating future benefits; and we know, that Christ as " our Passover was " facrificed for us."-Dr. Prieftley fays, that, if Christ "had died as a proper expiatory" facrifice, it might have been expected, that he would have died on the day of expiation:" but, according to our account, this was no way needful; Christ "our Passover was sacrificed for us" at the time of the Passover; and, though the annual atonement might eminently prefigure his death, yet inferior and more frequent facrifices feem to have, prefigured it also.

When I have tried to think without prejudice on this subject, I have found myself attending to the difference between the death of Christ and a common facrifice of a brute animal, in this respect; a common sacrifice originated from the owner of the animal; that is, from him who was to be benefited; either as offender, or as receiver of positive good, as the facrifice was a fin-offering or a peace-offering; whereas the death of Christ did not originate from the person to be benefited, but from Christ (under compact with his heavenly Father) the Victim and Priest, or from the "wicked" hands"

Two Sermons on the Sacrament, p. 15, 16. and fee Dr. Balguy's 7th Charge.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Εθυθη. 1 Cor. v. 7.
x Hift, Corr. Vol. 1. p. 194.

y See Heb. ix. 13, 14.-x. 11. 2 John x. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Acts ii. 23.

who put him to death b. This I mention, not as explaining the fubject, but as a difficulty, which has occurred to my mind. Dr. Prieftley has much the same thought. Yet one sees, that Brutes, and things inanimate, could not offer themselves to atone for others: if we suppose, that a man (who was properly fuch, as being in his own disposal,) by being facrificed, in any case, could atone for another, or that a man should "lay down his life for his' friend," we must suppose him to offer himself, . or not fuffer at all: what man could ask fuch a favour of "his friend?" Moses offers to devote himself, and St. Paul feems willing to be held as a curse for the Jewish people; but could they have been requested to do this? That Christ did offer himself voluntarily seems g clear: yet, you may say, he did not compel the Jews to kill him; they killed him "with wicked hands;" no; but he permitted them to kill him, when he might have faved h himfelf.

The permission is also to be ascribed to his heavenly Father.—Still it occurs to a thinking mind, that his death was foretold; and the thought brings difficulty along with it; difficulty perhaps insuperable; but not peculiar to this subject; no more belonging

There have been human facrifices, in which the victims did not make voluntary offers of their lives; but these were prisoners, or slaves, or something (Potter 1. 218.) considered as being wholly in the power of the sacrificers; as having no will of their own. Children have passed through the fire to Molech (Lev. xviii. 21. & xx. 2.) Micah vi. 7.

Our proposition, on this account, might as well be limited to persons who are in their own disposal: that idea is essential to devoting: but it seems implied, in speaking of a man, that he must be a free Agent. In Div. Leg. B. ix. there is something

about human facrifices.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART.XI. SECT.XXVII. 319

belonging to the death of Christ, than to any other voluntary action, whilst we are considering it as foreseen by the Deity: we do not know how God foresees, or influences, and so foretells, any voluntary action; but, in all predictions, man's usual freedom of acting, and choice, is supposed and taken for granted. And if, in this way, we reduce the death of Christ to the class of ordinary voluntary actions, though we may not understand their nature, the difficulty with respect to the death of Christ, as being a voluntary act foretold, is wholly obviated.

Another thought which has occurred to me, while I have been reflecting on this subject, is this; suppose Christ had not died, what would have been the consequence?—if he had done every thing else as he did, but at last yielded to the agony, which he suffered in his human nature, and had avoided death? —this seems a case, of which we are not competent judges:—facts must first happen, and then man can look back upon them, and form some judgment of them, by reason or analogy; but man cannot suppose facts, especially of an extraordinary sort, acts of the divine government, and judge what would have arisen from them. Yet we cannot conceive, that, if Christ

i Phænomena of Nature are folved, when they are reduced to a class of ordinary events; though many things remain inexplicable after the folution. Something of the same fort was said with relation to the doctrine of the Trinity, —Art. 1. Sect. VIII.

If any one says, that this question had better have been omitted, I answer, I should be of the same opinion if men, who think deeply about religion, would never discuss it. But as I believe it occurs to many thinking men, and often does harm, it seems best to prevent such harm, as far as possible. The solution here given is not particular, but general: or may easily be made so.

320 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXVIII. had avoided death, his merit would have been either so great or so evident as it now is: and then the Jewish facrifices, in that case, what would they have been? like the heathen; acts of piety, not wholly unnatural in times of ignorance, with fome tendency to quiet the conscience, and draw forth fome religious sentiments; but, in themfelves, in the eye of reason, foolish and absurd: continually aiming at that, which they could not possibly effect. "For it is not possible, that the blood of Bulls and of Goats should take away fin." But consider these sacrifices as a part of a religion, which was but to be temporary, whose end was to prepare mankind to receive a dispensation rational and univerfal, and they themselves become rational and important: and whatever first proves them to be important, proves itself to be fo likewise: in this light, the Epistle to the Hebrews is inestimable. I have before observed, that the Jewish religion cannot but be true: can that religion be false, which makes those parts of it, that at first fight seem weak and idle, to appear firm, wife, and worthy to be ordained, in their particular feafon, by the counfels of the supreme and all-perfect Being?

are we to think, that the merits, the sufferings, and the death of Christ, appear in the sight of God? Of this only we can be perfectly certain, that we cannot attain to an adequate conception of the matter: all that we can say is, that there is nothing incredible, nothing inconsistent with what we know of the word or works of God, in the account, that the Heavenly Father may regard Christ as a

good

<sup>1</sup> Heb. x. 4.

m Book 1. Chap. xv1. Sect. v111. Part v1. or Vol. 1. p. 199. — See also Book 1v. Art. v1. Sect. v111. & 1x.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART.XI. SECT. XXIX. 321

good and virtuous being; and may look favourably on frail and finful men, on account of his having taught them, and suffered for them; and on account of their being formed into a society, of which He is the Head. And lastly, that he may regard the Death of Christ, as something which we, as far as we are able to conceive the Nature of it, should call a sacrifice; though the sacrifice of the Son of God, must be an event, great, transcendent; above the reach, not only of our comprehension, but even of our imagination.

XXIX. In former Articles, and in that to which our present disquisition is an Appendix, we have proposed, as an objection, this question; will not the doctrine in hand tend to disgust plain thinking men, and men of philosophical minds? this objection is not less suitable here than on former

occasions.

We may conceive a person of this description, to say, 'Surely this matter about men's being made eternally happy on account of the Head of our Religion, is folly and weakness: one man die to save others; how groundless the expectation!—the innocent punished for the guilty; and that by the immediate appointment of the Deity! who could make men happy by a single word, in a moment, whenever he pleased; without such a cumbrous apparatus of Instruments!

1. The idea of one man's dying to deliver others from destruction or evil, is congenial to the human mind, in a state of "simplicity. Curtius" leaped

· Liv. vii. 6.

The flory of *Iphigenia* would not have been made a fubject for the *Drama*, if fpectators, auditors, readers, had not been likely to be affected by it.—The flory of *Corefus* and *Callirhoi* flows the fame principle with that mentioned by the High Prieft of the Jews.

into the gulf for that purpose: we have already mentioned Moses and St. Paul; and we find the High Priest of the Jews rebuking the Council for not recollecting this truth: " it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." He spoke this, indeed, as High Prieft, and his speech was prophetic; but to his hearers it would, at the moment, appear as an instance of an acknowledged maxim. —I do not fay, that a person may not devote himfelf through enthusiasm, and without reason; indeed reason cannot justify such devoting, in affairs divine or human, but on the known acceptance of him, who has the power of remitting punishment: but still I should be cautious of declaring, wholly and peremptorily, against a mode of expiation, into which men, in different ages and fituations, feem to have been led by a natural fentiment.

The Decii devoted themselves. See Kennet's Antiquities, Index Decii; or Book iv. Chap. viii. p. 198.—with a passage about them from Juvenal,

Sat. viii. 254.

2. The innocent punished for the guilty:—this is a palmary q objection:—After observing that the sufferings of Christ were voluntary, I would ask, what this objection really means? Does it mean, that a doctrine cannot be of God which implies, that a worthy man suffers, and that wicked men derive good from his sufferings? surely that happens commonly, in the course of God's Governvernment of this world: and that inconvenience, which frequently occurs under the Divine Providence, cannot prove any dispensation, under which it does occur, not to be divine.—What was said under

P John xi. 50.

q Famil. Illustr. p. 51.—Butler's Anal. Part ii. Chap. v. p. 253, 12mo.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXIX. 323 under the ninth Article on the 18th Chapter of Ezekiel, might be recollected here. But, when it is faid, that the innocent are punished for the guilty, we are apt to be missed by words. Punishment, in the strict' sense, implies guilt; consequently, in that fense, it cannot be said, that the innocent are punished; nor is it true, that worthy men have evil inflicted on them by authority; as no one can have authority to inflict evil on innocence; in all cases, therefore, where it is said, that the innocent are punished for the guilty, punishment must be taken in its popular sense, and mean no more than suffering. The innocent, then, suffer for the guilty; this still rather gives a wrong idea; because it is not the Law of God's Government generally expressed, but only a particular case of that general Law. The Law feems to be, properly, Men suffer for one another: sometimes the more worthy for the less worthy; but sometimes the less worthy for the more worthy: which shall fuffer, feems partly accidental. It is plain enough, that whatever' unites men is beneficial to them; and common fufferings must tend to union, as well as common enjoyments: but this need not be infifted on here: we are not justifying the ways of the God of Nature, we are only endeavouring to flew, that what happens according to the Doctrine of Atonement, happens also in a course of Nature .-Christ's suffering for mankind is certainly no more contrary to Justice, than a Soldier's stepping before his comrade, or commander, in battle, and receiving the deadly stroke of the enemy; though Christ died, "the just for the" unjust."

3. As

Art. IX. Sect. XXXVIII.

Sect. xv1.—Ludlam, Essay 2d. p. 25.

Art. 1x. Sect. xxx. " Pet. iii. 18.

## 324 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXX.

3. As to God's making men happy when he pleased, without the intervention of suffering, or of a Mediator; it admits of little or no doubt: as far as we have any idea, he certainly could: and, if he had done so, we could have found no fault. But neither ought we to make any difficulty, if he has made use of intermediate steps. It is perfectly agreeably to the course of Nature, that this should be done, and therefore doing it might be the effect of the divine wisdom.—As Bishop Butler\* and Dr. Taylor, have written well on this matter, I will read you a passage or two from their writings.

And it has been generally thought, that we may go one step farther than saying, that we ought to make no objection to God's using instruments in effecting our Salvation; according to some thinking men, we may venture to say, that the Christian dispensation, by representing God as using means, points out more strongly the importance of virtue, and the danger of vice, than an unconditional pardon would have done. "This," says Bp. Butler, "has never yet been answered, and is

I think plainly unanswerable."

xxx. I will mention no more objections fingly; but it might not be amiss here, as under the second Article, to mention a few cautions, each of which would enable a reader of controversy to solve several objections. Indeed the same which were there mentioned, might be equally useful here; and I can scarcely conceive, that any one, who had

x Analogy, Part ii. Chap. v. beginning.

y On Romans, Key, Par. 150. Some of the arguments here proposed are urged and illustrated in my Poem on Redemption.

2 Dr. Balguy's Pref. to his Father's tract, p. vi.—Bp. Butler, Anal. 2. 5. towards the end.

had attentively applied those cautions to the cases, by which they are exemplified, could want any farther directions about them .- I will therefore content myself with a very few instances. The first, fecond, and third cautions I will pass over, though they might possibly be of some use with regard to our Saviour's sufferings, and the dignity of his character; but I will mention, as an instance of the fourth, about partial quotations, what Dr. Prieftley ' fays of the Scape-Goat, that " The phrase bearing fin is never applied in the Old Testament, but to the scape-goat :"--whereas those, who examine farther b, will find this observation not well founded: --- any more than the affirming, that our doctrine is not delivered in the Gospels, or Acts of the Apostles.—After what we have seen cited from Scripture about Justification by Faith, it may appear strange to be told, that the Apostles never once "directly affert the infufficiency of our good works alone to entitle us to the favour of God and future happiness." Had any one read such an affertion, and examined no farther, how would he have been deceived!

The fifth caution may be kept in mind, though there does not feem to be so much occasion for it here as under the fecond Article; it is indeed often applicable with regard to metaphorical expressions, but of these we have spoken separately. argument of our adversaries here meant, is this; because a certain word bears this sense in this passage, it cannot bear another sense in another paffage.-Any one might try the fense of " for d 115,"

<sup>\*</sup> Famil. Illust. p. 51. - Hist. Corr. 1. 203.

b Short Defence, p. 75, 76.—Barnabas has fomething about the scape-goat being a type of Christ.—Epistle, Sect. 7.
6 Hist. Corr. 1. p. 165.
6 Hist. Corr. 1. 199.

326 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXXI.

us," as equivalent to, "on our account,"—"for our benefit." Or the fense of bearing our fins, for taking them away by reforming us: any one may ask, whether it is natural to say, that Christ reformed us "in his own body, on the tree."

The fixth caution concerning the particular views, wishes, prejudices, of those who are adduced as authorities, may always be usefully kept

in mind, while we are reading controversy.

Of the seventh caution, I will give an instance.

—Read first 1 Cor. i. 12, 13.—with 1 Cor. iii. 5. and then substitute the name of Stephen, or any other martyr, for that of Christ, in the expressions concerning the efficacy of Christ's death; and you will perceive how unscriptural they will appear.—Yet we are told, that the Quakers have held, that "the blood of Christ was no more than the blood of any other Saint s."

What was just now said about Christ's bearing our sins in his own body, on the tree; implied a

substitution.

xxxi. I have now done with Proof of every fort. If we keep up our method, we shall make some kind of Application; consisting of a form of assent, mutual concessions, and hints about improvements.— A form of assent can only be a declaration of the truth of the proposition, which we have been endeavouring to prove. But we might see whether any similar proposition would hold good on principles of Natural Religion. Might not an Heathen profess something of the following sort? referring to his declaration under the preceding Article?

· Howsoever

Folie's Works, Fol. Vol. 2. p. 195. and quoted in Jones's Preservative, p. 26.

## BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART. XI. SECT. XXXIII.327

· Howfoever I may labour to form my principles, I must not neglect the religion of my Country, whether its ordinances confift in Sacrifices, or in any other modes of worship. It is a relief to the mind merely to attempt to expiate Sin; though I feel the imperfection of facrificing Brutes. -I have read of people's devoting themselves, in order to fave others from destruction; I know of no instance in later ages, and all undertakings of fuch fort must be vain, unless they are known to be ratified by Heaven: But, if any fuch thing should ever take place, I should feel the plan as one confolatory to my mind, as acknowledging the importance of Virtue and the danger of Vice; and I should embrace it far as lay in my power.

xxxII. The Christian might make his profession in some form like that before used; 'I believe, that God will confer eternal happiness on all sincere Christians, notwithstanding some imperfections of theirs, with a great regard to the merits, the

fufferings, and the death of Jesus Christ.'

fions might be made by contending parties, we may conceive, that each might contribute some-

thing towards a coalition.

We, possibly, might compile some scriptural Forms, which we might use in a literal sense, our adversaries in a metaphorical one.—We might acknowledge, that of the Counsels of Heaven, with regard to the grounds and reasons of the Redemption of the world, we know hoothing:—and that some kind of comparison is implied even in what we call literal accounts of the Christian Sacrifice.

h Dr. Balguy, p. 201.—Butler's Anal. p. 250, 12°. Part ii. Chap. v.

328 BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART.XI. SECT.XXXIV.

Sacrifice. Comparison is not very remote from

Metaphor.

Our adversaries might allow us some use of those expressions, which we dare not wholly give up. Surely they might bring themselves to own, that our Salvation has some reference to the merits of our spiritural Lord, the Head of our Body. I know a Socinian, who will use that language freely; one, who has shewn his sincerity by giving up his clerical profession and collegiate establishment.

Both parties are proceeding in one way, though they may be helped forward by different motives.—Both own the Mercy of God; both ascribe to it the salvation of Mankind; though we suppose it to use some Means, which they do not: but of these means our ideas are so indefinite, as to produce propositions nearly unintelligible; the nature of which, we know, is such, as to diminish greatly the difference between affirmative

and negative 1.

xxxiv. As to improvements; when men differ much on any subject, it is always to be hoped, that some new views of the principles, or fundamental parts, of that subject, will finally bring about an agreement. In the present subject, perhaps something might be done by giving still more attention than has been given, to the nature of Sacrifices, Heathen and Jewish. It seems as if we ought to go entirely upon Facts, and not suffer ourselves to run into anything, which can properly be called an Hypothesis. In this cautious

Book 111. Chap. x. Sect. 1x.

Warburton on the Holy Spirit, p. 339. (near end).

\* "See that ye fall not out by the way." Gen. xlv. 24. this
was faid by Joseph to his Brethren.

BOOK IV. APPEND. TO ART.XI. SECT.XXXIV. 329

tious conduct we should be much affisted by attending to the errors, into which Divines have already run, who did not ground their researches on experiment; in which we include, knowledge of the written word of God, as well as of his works.



ARTICLE

## ARTICLE XII.

## OF GOOD WORKS.

A LBEIT that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our fins, and endure the severity of God's judgement; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

might have been said under this Article. Whatever is said of Faith, has some relation to good works; they are often opposed to each other, and always connected. As I shall endeavour to avoid repetition and tautology, the History of this Article will be short; though I mean to observe the same method as in the preceding.

This Article was not amongst those of 1552; it was added in 1562; in order, probably, to recommend the Reformation to many rational and worthy persons, and to check some mischiefs, which had been growing in the preceding ten years.—Indeed it appears, that the Reformers, Calvin and Luther, had said some harsh things a, which wanted softening.

See Nicholls on the Article: he quotes from Luther de Lib. Christ.—And from Calvin, Inst. 3. 14.

fostening, though they have been softened in most of the Consessions of the Resormed. Mr. Ridley, in his Life of Bishop Ridley, speaks of the "wild conclusions of some Solifidians and Antinomians:"—also, of the Antinomians' unoperative Faith, and "the Gospellers' fond persuasion of being in God's favour without works."—And we find it an expression of the times, that "carnal Liberty" was to be apprehended from a wrong notion of the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone: and those who ran into abuse of carnal liberty, seem to have been called Libertini.

11. It is not till very lately, that I have read the ninth Book of the Divine Legation of Moses. -The idea contained in it, is fomething like this: Man was first in a state of nature and under natural religion; this was before he was placed in Paradife: during that time, his good moral conduct, or obedience to natural law, might get him a reward, though not an eternal reward; his foul was formed capable of separate existence, after death; and his Reason made him accountable; but his hopes of futurity must be indefinite. His repentance might restore him to favour. - But in Paradife, he was under revealed religion: and his peculiar obedience was to a positive duty given in addition to moral duties: at least, the peculiar reward of his fituation, which was Immortality, depended on his abitaining from the forbidden fruit; forbidden, not by natural law, but by positive injunction. On his disobedience, he was fent, back

b Page 345. & 352.

Gospellers mentioned before, Art x. Sect. x 11.

d Ridley's Life, page 351.—Homilies p. 20. octavo. (2d on Salvation).

Mosheim, Cent. 16th. 3. 2. 38.—Strype's Annals, Vol. 2. p. 451,—Dickinson's Letters.—Contents of Baxter's 11th Conference in his Catholic Theology, B. ii.—Libertine is one of the persons of the Dialogue.

into his state of nature, and every thing was as at first: at length the Jewish dispensation prepared the way, and Christianity, "in the sulness of time," followed. Again man was under revealed religion; again his reward Immortality; a free gist, which was to follow on his Faith only: thus faith was injoined, but by a positive injunction;—yet this free gift of Immortality was not to be bestowed on all indiscriminately, though they professed the Faith; there was a requisite qualification, that is, Virtue, or good works:—thus Justification by Faith was founded on Virtue, instead of opposing it. I fear I scarcely do justice to this system, but to have some idea of it will be useful to us.

111. It may be proper to have some notion of the manner, in which some persons usually called Methodists have expressed themselves with regard to good works; I will read a passage or two sor that

purpose. g

iv. It does not feem needful to go farther into Historical remarks, on the present Article. I will,

therefore, come to the Explanation.

v. "Albeit that,"—these words imply a connexion with the preceding Article; and, as it seems to me, an apprehension of danger from it: a fear, lest it should be understood, that, because Faith is the principle, or disposition, which a person has when he enters into the society of Christians, and by which therefore he becomes interested in the merits of Christ, and benefited by them, lest, I say, it should be understood, that a mere sentiment is all that is required of a Christian.

VI. "Good

f Faith is a natural principle, I think, fupposing Christianity: but Christianity not being natural, Faith, its fundamental principle, may be called positive. I see not, however, that Bishop Warburton had this idea.

g Letter to Mr. Berridge; —or Principles and Practices, p. 56. 58.

vi. "Good works"-we have had two forts of good works before; natural h and Christian : and in the thirteenth Article, we have "works," without the epithet "good:"-the good works here meant are of the Christian fort. This is implied in the connexion between this Article and the preceding: -which connexion fays, or implies, that although Christians are justified by Faith, they must not neglect Virtue.-we find these works, on a solemn occasion, called " works t of Grace :" and, in the Necessary Doctrine, "works of righteousness:"-where thefe good works are opposed to good works of penitents; and "al the good workes of a true Christen man" are divided into three branches, according to the exhortation of St. Paul', that we should live soberly, justly, and devoutly; -that is, in the practice of duties towards God, our neighbours, and ourselves. - The good works here spoken of, admit of various degrees of goodness; fome may be nearer to perfection, some farther off. -In fome texts of scripture, absolute perfection feems to be intended; but then that is ideal perfection, fomething to be aimed at; of which we shall speak hereafter: at present, the idea seems to be, of good qualities not beyond the reach of probability, of actions popularly called good; not inconsistent with fome fins which are to be " put away:" fuch actions as are called " of themselves unworthy, unperfect", unsufficient."

Under

Art. x. Sect. xviii.

Art. x. Sect. xxx111. and Art. x1. Sect. xv111:

By a dying Papist, Dr. Redman.—See Ridley, p. 351.

<sup>1</sup> Titus ii. 12.

m Necessary Doctrine, under Good Workes.—Homily, p. 12.

Under these good works are comprehended good fentiments "-Faith, Repentance, " inward spiritual workes, mocions, and defires, as the Love and feare of God"," &c. As, under the ninth Article, bad fentiments were put upon o a footing with bad actions.

"Which are the fruits of Faith"-these VII. words only feem to be a farther description of Christian good works:-the comparison will occur again, between good actions as springing from Faith, and fruits from a tree.

vIII. " And follow after Justification;" - this expression has seemed somewhat difficult; but it means no more than the preceding expression, to characterize Christian good works: our being admitted into Christianity, is sometimes called our being justified, because it was sometimes called so by the facred writers, and because, on our admisfion, we are put into a state of justification; into a way p of being eternally happy, if all things go on well; we are faid to be, even then, faved .-But as we may lose our way, and not be "accounted righteous" at the day of judgment, or finally, this justification at admission is sometimes distinguished, when there is need of distinction, (and not else) by the name of our first justification; and the other, our being accounted righteous at the day of judgment, is called our final justi-This has been mentioned before, but fication.

m "Keep the commandments:" lowing God is the first and great commandment. The fecond is Love of Man. On these commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

o Art. 1x. Sect. xxx. n Nec. Doct. P This feems to be expressed, Titus iii. 7. "Being justified

by his Grace, we should be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal Life."

<sup>9</sup> Art. 1x. Sect. xxx11. - Art. x. Sect. xxix. & Art. x1. Sect. xIV.

Art. x1. Sect. x1v.

may be repeated usefully, both here, and in the next Article'.

That this account agrees with the language used at the time of the Reformation, a few instances will be fufficient to prove. - The necessary Doctrine, fpeaking of Christian good workes, calls them such as "men truly justified, and fo continuing," do work: "workes of righteousnesse in Christ, whiche he cannot do, afore he be justified." In the Article of Justificacion Baptism is mentioned, as the way "by the whiche God hath determined that man beying of age and commyng to Christendome shuld be justified."—In the Homily on Salvation (third part) it is faid, "Our office (officium, duty,) is, not to pass the time of this present Life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are baptized or justified:" and in that on fasting (one of the second book of Homilies)-" Good works go not before in him, which shall afterward be justified, but good works do follow after when a man is first justified." taken from Augustin de fide et operibus. And immediately afterwards, good works are spoken of as " testimonies of our Justification"."

There is the more need of this account of justification, as some of our Christian brethren seem to conceive it as giving them a title to eternal happiness, which cannot be forfeited. All justification must be ascribed to the Grace of God, in some sense;

s Justification, between the first and the final, supposed variable; sometimes increasing, sometimes decreasing; there are several expressions to this purpose in Cranmer's Necessary Doctrine. It is not paged; but in the Articles on Justification and good workes the passages are easily found.

There are two passages to our present purpose in Ridley's

Life, p. 347.

Alfo fee Jon. Edwards, p. 32.

fense; and the Grace of God is connected with the influence of his holy spirit; hence an idea seems to have been formed out of all these things, that when we are received into the divine favour, we are inspired, and so informed or assured of our acceptance. And the inspiration is, I believe, called justifying Grace; and is made equivalent to Regeneration, or Conversion: I imagine, that all this is a good deal owing to our seldom, if ever, using the word Justification as it is used in our Article and

Homily, as fynonymous to Baptism2.

It may perhaps bear a doubt, whether all the Article, so far, is not a mere subject, or nominative case: as if it had been said, - Although such good works as are the fruits of Faith, and follow justification, cannot,' &c .- if this be right, there is not here any affertion or proposition, that good works are the fruits of Faith, &c .- Bennet and Veneer make that a Proposition. There is no authentic copy of the Articles; on that account, conjecture may have the freer scope. In the Latin, in Bishop Sparrow's collection, and Bishop Burnet's copy, there is no comma after "Bona Opera."-"Bona opera quæ sunt fructus fidei," &c .- The more I look at the Article, and compare the beginning with the end of it, the more I am inclined to this construction: and no one, I believe, has any right to censure my adopting it.

IX. "Cannot

cor vi. 11. We have washing, or Baptism, sanctification, (or being set apart as sacred) justification, and inspiration, all together.—But these words mean nothing more than Baptism, with the privileges which attend it, supposing men to do their part faithfully.

y This expression is used Art. x1. Sect. 1v.

For conversion, see opening of Letter to Mr. Berridge, Principles, &c. Regeneration sometimes is equivalent to Baptism: as in Art. 1x. Sect. xx1v. the Methodistical notion of Regeneration, see Principles, &c. p. 30.

1X. "Cannot put away our fins,"—the Latin is expiare: this implies, that the Christian is liable to fin, a truth which has been disputed; it has been in some measure proved under the ninth Article, and will occur again under the fifteenth and sixteenth. This expression also marks the impersection of Christian good works, in the notion of our Church, as before.—Yet it is conceivable, that some persons might understand by the sins here spoken of, sins committed before admission into Christianity.

" And endure the severity of God's Judgment;" -when we regard the effects of our good works on our past offences, we look backwards; when we think of their effects on our future life, we look forwards'. In the former case, we perceive fins distinctly; in the latter case, we see that it is posfible, in theory, that we may avoid each fin, and therefore all fin; but it is so improbable, that we have no expectation of any man's being fo perfect; and therefore we fay, popularly, speaking from our feelings, that it is impossible. A man's whole life is judged together .- " The feverity of God's judgment," means, "judgment without mercy "," actions might not endure that, which might be favourably received on a footing of candour and indulgence.

xI. "Yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God, in Christ"—" pleasing,"—we may apply to this word, what has been said concerning the displeasure of God. Actions may be pleasing to one in authority, which cannot acquit an offender. Humanity

a Art. Ix. Sect. xxx II.

b Something like this, Art. x1. Sect. xv111. end.

Art. x. Sect. xxv. and before that; as Art. 1x. Sect. x11. and xxxv. end.—and Introd. to second Part, Sect. 1v.

d James ii. 13.

Book 1. Chap. x 1x. and Art. 1x. Sect. xx11.

manity in a robber, shewn in restraining his associates, must be pleasing to a Judge, though the offender must still be considered as a robber.— We have had "good works pleasant and acceptable to God"—in the tenth Articles; meaning the same thing with "pleasing and acceptable," in this.

"In Christ"—on account of Christ, for his fake.
—in Eph. iv. 32. we have, "for Christ's fake;" in the original, it is en Xers.

xII. The rest of this Article must be read together: Indeed, I know not whether the Article

might not be faid to end here.

"And do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit."

It was before faid, that good works " are the fruits of Faith;" whether that is proposition, or definition, it would be idle and unmeaning to fay,-'the fruits of faith spring out from faith, as fruits from a tree;' the compilers of our Articles were men of fense, and of improved minds: they would not use such language; nor shall we get the true fense of the Article till we avoid it.—Let us then suppose the main part of the Article to come to an end with the words, "pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ;"—and the rest to be added in order, at the same time, to apologize for the addition of this twelfth Article, and to forward the end and defign of adding it. The meaning of the last fentence might then be, 'What is here expressed, was in reality implied under the preceding Article; for, if Faith be taken for that honest g vital principle

8 Art. x1. Sect. xv11.

f "Acceptable and pleasant to God," Hom. on Faith, first part, p. 27. 8vo. top.

which, in common fense, it must be taken for, it must of course produce the works which are here required; -however, left hypocritical men should make pretenfions to a principle of true Christianity, which they really have not; it feems best to obviate fuch pretenfions; and to declare, not only that virtue is acceptable to God, but that no man h must pretend to be a Christian who neglects it: that if any one has a true Christian Faith, it will be fure to work by Love, and to shew itself in virtuous habits of every kind. God can know a right faith intuitively, but man can only judge of its reality and its nature, by the works which it produces.' "I will flew thee" (fays St. James ii. 18.) "my faith by my works."—If we take the words in this light, it feems to me, that the different parts of the Article are rightly connected together, and form one legitimate logical whole. -Christian works, though imperfect, are pleasing to God; we must not neglect them, because we are justified by Faith: indeed our Faith itself will not be what the Scripture supposes, if we do.

x111. Perhaps this may appear more plain, if we take notice of a few particular expressions in the sentence.

"Necessarily,"—does not in itself seem to imply a strict or absolute necessity; but only what we call necessity in a popular sense ;—if there is a right Faith, virtue will spring out of it in the common course of things; yet so as to allow of some variety

h See opening of Homily on Faith, 3d part, p. 32, octavo.

"No man should think that he hath that lively Faith," &c. and 2d. part, p. 30, 8vo. every man must (by this criterion) "examine and try himself diligently," &c.

k How common this fense is, has been lately seen under Sect. x. by the number of instances there referred to.

of degrees, and of some failures. In the affirmation a comparison is contained: as therefore "a tree planted by the water side, that will bring forth his fruit in due season," is liable, for a time, to miss producing its proper fruit; and the description is only intended to correspond to the ordinary state of things, to that on which we ast; so it is with Faith.

What Faith is, we have before m defined; XIV. but what, you may ask, is "a true and lively Faith?"—why nothing more than Faith, without any epithets: true, or real, is only used when people are likely to call fomething faith, which really is not fuch; which no plain honest man would conceive to be meant when we argue about Faith; no man, who had a common understanding, and was free from all defign, and perverseness. - " Lively" is the word, which was used at the Reformation for living, in opposition to dead. "A lively facrifice," in our communion office, is opposed to the offering of a dead" victim. One might fay, a true and lively tree, as well as a true and lively Faith; but every one would think the epithets fuperfluous, in fpeaking about fruit-trees°, or any trees where growth and produce was implied; and would be apt to cry out, 'how could you imagine that I meant, by a fruit-tree, one that was cut down, and fit only for fuel P?"

In

<sup>1</sup> Pfalm i. 3. m Art. x1. Sect xv11.

The fentence is taken from Rom. xii. 1.—where the word is "living."

o See the Note about reconciling St. Paul and St. James, Art. x1. Sect. xxv11.

P A Gentleman's Porter in London, who used to send parcels into the country, with a bill, put in one of his bills of parcels, the article, "A live dog:" the epithet live was voted superfluous, because no one would think of having a dead dog sent by a waggon into the country.—And the epithet lively, or living

In our Homily? of Salvation, "lively" is opposed to "dead;" "That faith, which bringing forth" either evil works or no good works, "is not a right, pure, and lively faith, but a dead, devilish, counterfeit, and feigned faith."—The epithet "devilish" is used in reference to that fine verse of St. James, "the Devils also believe;—and tremble."

xv. "Discerned"—to discern, is to see the disference;—a tree may be "discerned by the fruit," should mean, one may tell whether a tree is a vine or a fig-tree, by its bearing grapes or figs. According to this, one should judge of the kind of principles which a man has, by his actions; but the Article only seems to intend to say, that you shall judge whether a man has a living or a dead saith by his doing good works, or no good works: as you may judge whether a tree is alive or dead by its bearing or not bearing; so that one need not conceive two kinds of trees, but only one kind; one tree dead, and another alive. Indeed the Latin word for discerned is only "judicari;" and the corresponding word about Faith, "known."

xvi. I put an end to this explanation by obferving, that, as a tree may bear fruit unequally in different years, or even sometimes miss bearing, without being dead, so we may perhaps conceive even a lively faith to be not wholly inconsistent with some inequalities

would be equally superfluous when joined to Faith, if hypocrify had never made it useful. Our first Homily on Faith mentions "the living body of a Man:" if any one who promised to send twenty men, sent twenty dead men, he would scarcely be thought to have sulfilled his promise. This, though not the thought of the Homily, is implied in the last verse of the second Chapter of St. James's Epistle.

Third part, p. 23. 8vo.—See also opening of Hom. on Faith; 2d part, and p. 30.

242 BOOK IV. ART. XII, SECT. XVII.-XIX.

inequalities and deficiencies. Yet most usually, fruittrees bear fruit; and illustrations by comparison go upon the ordinary course of things.— So this comparative excuse must not be carried too far.

xvii. We come next to our *Proof*, the first business of which is always to see what *propositions* will want proving.

1. Good works of Christians cannot put away

or expiate past fins.

2. They cannot endure judgment, on a footing of strict Justice.

3. They are " pleasing and acceptable to God."

4. The ground on which they are fo, is a regard in God to Christ.

5. When Faith is enjoined in Scripture, it is supposed productive, or vital; as much as when a man is commanded to do anything, he is supposed to be alive.

away or expiate past fins. This seems self-evident; or, no reason can be assigned why they should: suppose an hundred good actions, could they make any man innocent, who had committed murder, robbery, adultery, &c.? most wicked men perform many actions, which are innocent, or even useful: even a robber robs but seldom.—Besides, those actions of Christians, which are called good works, are in fact imperfect, and are allowed to be so.—And moreover, remission must be an act of God; we cannot see how it can be the immediate effect of human actions: when they are instrumental to our remission, it must be because they are made so by the Divine Goodness.

xix. Good works of Christians (such as are commonly called so) cannot endure judgment, on a

footing of strict Justice.

If all men have finned, and Christian good works cannot expiate sin, this must follow: for a man's whole life will be judged at once.

But, under the preceding Article, we have already shewn, that we are not accounted righteous

before God for our own works.

The judgment here spoken of is understood, I imagine, to be made with a view to eternity; now whatever some men may think our good works deferve, no reasonable man can think, that they deferve an eternity of supreme happiness. This is farther insisted on by Bp. Warburton, in the ninth Book's of his Divine Legation.

xx. The good actions of Christians are pleasing

to God .-

This is our principal proposition, under the prefent Article. - But, in proving it, I would not confine myself to those texts, which mention Christian virtue merely as pleasing or acceptable to the Deity; I would also mention some of those, which reprefent it as the great' end of the Christian dispensation: for it is evident, that whatever accomplishes: the main purpose of Christianity, must be pleasing to him from whom it proceeded. We may add, that those actions which God rewards, must be acceptable to him: and so must the opposites to such as he punishes .- The best and fullest proof of our present proposition, that I know of, is in Taylor's Key to the Apostolic writings; it begins at Paragraph 167, and extends to 288.—All that I can now do, is to felect a few of the plainest texts, fuch as shew themselves to be to our purpose without any comment; and conclude with his coriclu-

fion:

Art. XI. Sect. XXIII. Page 630 4to.

t There is, indeed, another great end of Christianity, which ought never to be overlooked: procuring forgiveness of fins; without which Virtue could not attain its reward.

fion: though I would recommend a full confideration of the Proof to each fludent, that he may be the better prepared not only for preaching Christian Virtue, but for reading the arguments of Antinomians, and of those who favour the Agency of God on the human mind in the

greatest degree.

That our Church does allow Virtue to be the main end of Christianity, seems true. In the Neceffary Doctrine, &c. the part on Good Workes begins thus; " All preachynge and learnyng of the worde of God in Christis churche, ought to tende to this ende, that men maie be induced, not onely to knowe God, and to beleve and truste in hym, but also to honour and ferve hym with good woorkes," &c. -And our Homily, second part on Faith, says, <sup>66</sup> All Holy Scripture beareth witness, that a true lively (the epithets of our Article) faith in Christ doth bring forth good works."

But to come to our Selection.

Matt. v. 16.—Let your light fo shine before men, that they may fee your

good works.

20.—except your righteousness shall exceed the righteoulness of the Scribes, &c. ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

vii. 21.—doing the Will of God is greatly preferred to calling Chrift Lord.

23.—Christ tells the workers of iniquity, that he never knew them; even though they had prophefied and wrought miracles in his name.

The

The parables of the Virgins, Talents, &c. aim to promote good works.

Luke i. 75.—gives a general idea of Christians as ferving God in holiness and righte-ousness.

In the Acts of the Apostles, the thing proclaimed on great occasions, on eminent publications of Christianity, is, God sent Christ to bless you in turning away every one of you from his *iniquities*.

Acts x. 2.—Cornelius, representing the Gentiles, is commended as devout, giving much alms to the people, and performing the duty of prayer.

--- ver. 35.—religion and righteousness are ac-

--- xx. 21.—the Ephesians are instructed to unite repentance towards God with faith towards Jesus Christ.

--- ver. 25.—He reasons publicly to Felix on righteousness, temperance, and a future judgment.

that his commission was, to turn men from the power of Satan unto God; to call upon them to repent, and to do works meet for repentance.

Rom. vi. 4. 22.—We are perfuaded to walk in newness of *Life*; to have our fruit unto holiness.

Rom.

Rom. xii. 1.—We are to make ourfelves a living facrifice, (Liturgy, lively,) holy, acceptable.

r Cor. vi. 20.—Christ hath bought us with a price; and therefore we are to glorify God in Body and Spirit.

able, always abounding in the work of the Lord: our labour will not be in vain.

2 Cor. ix. 7 .- God loveth a chearful giver.

Gal. v. 6.—Faith is to work by Love: or benevolence.

--- vi. 9.—We are not to be weary in well-doing; with future reward.

Ephes. iv. 24\*.—The Christian character (the new man) consists in righteousness and holiness.

Phil. iv. 8.—Enumerates the qualities of virtuous actions; with warm feeling.

1 Thess. ii. 4.—We are to perform moral duties, not as pleasing men, but God.

---- iv. 7.—We are called (or made Chriftians) unto holiness.

I Tim. i. 19.- Without Conscience, we should make shipwreck concerning Faith.

his Family (01x2101) has denied the Faith, and is worse than an Infidel.

2 Tim. ii. 19.— Every one that nameth the name of Christ must depart from iniquity.

Titus

<sup>\*</sup> In Eph. ii. compare verse 9, with verse 10. the one against reckoning on works, particularly before becoming a Christian; the other against neglecting them afterwards.

- Titus ii. 14.—The end of Christ's death was, to redeem us from iniquity, and consecrate a set of men zealous of good works.
- --- iii. 8.—Believers must be careful to maintain good works; profitable to mankind.
- Heb. x. 24.—Christians must stimulate one another to benevolence and good works.
- xiii. 16.—With Beneficence God is well pleased.
- ver. 18.—The proof of a good confcience is, a resolution to live honestly in all things.
- James ii. 14.—26.—Is capital; celebrated; but should here be read carefully.
- 1 Pet. ii. 20.—Patience in the cause of Virtue is acceptable with God.
- wer. 24.—Christ died on the Cross for a moral purpose; that we should being dead to sins, live to righte-ousness.
- 2 Pet. i. 5.—We are to add to our Faith Virtue.

  1 John iii. 8.—Christ's purpose was, to destroy the reorks of the Devil.
- ver. 22.—Christians do things pleasing in the fight of God.

Though we have made only a felection, yet our proof, that Christians are to be virtuous, and may please God by being so, is abundant. Nevertheless, it is to be observed, that each Christian is not to pursue what he may call Virtue according to his own fancy and caprice; without rule or order; without authority; without social regards; without attention to the Scriptures. Our service is to be a "reasonable service," (Rom. xii. 1.) which

it certainly cannot be if we neglect the word of God.

Christians are pleasing to God, is a regard to the

merit of Christ. (ED XOISW).

In the preceding Article, we have proved, that we are justified by Faith, or by the merits of Christ: and in the Appendix we have shewn the efficacy of the merit, sufferings, and death of Christ in removing out of the way our trangressions and imperfections, so that they shall not act as impediments to our avoiding the displeasure, and gaining the favour of God; yet perhaps something might be mentioned, which affirms more directly, that our good works are accepted through Christ. Is, indeed, we are accounted righteous through his merits, that is sufficient for our purpose; yet a few passages may confirm, and illustrate.

Whenever any good is mentioned, which arises from the virtues of men, considered as members of the Church of Christ, or, as it may be expressed, as members of Christ, that good must be ascribed to a regard, in God, for Christ. Thus, as we are branches of a vine, our fruit would be of no value but on account of the stem, to which we are united. And members, or limbs, have their proper useful functions, through their union with the Head, from whence the Nerves proceed. The endearing connection marked out Eph. v. 25-33, should not be overlooked. See also Eph. ii. 20,

21, the idea of a building.

Again, those virtues which we practice in imitation of Christ, must be supposed, when they are accepted,

2 Appendix to Art. x1. Sect. xx11.

y Art. xI. Sect. xxIV.

a Jonathan Edwards speaks to the same purpose: page 70. on Justification.

b John xv. 4.

c Eph. iv. 15, 16.

accepted, to be accepted on his account: to this purpose we may consult Matt. xi. 29.—Eph. v. 2.
—1 Pet. i. 15.—ii. 20, 21.—1 John ii. 6.—iii. 3. and other texts of Scripture. Indeed such conduct as these texts prescribe is something more than mere imitation: it is putting ourselves upon a sooting truly Christian.

ing truly Christian.

There are several texts, which speak of Christians as created unto good works in Christ, or ordained, &c. that is, of Christians as intended to be holy or virtuous: these works must be accepted; how? surely through Christ. See Rom. viii. 1. 29.—Gal. v. 6.—Eph. i. 4. 6.—Eph. ii. 10.—Eph. v. 8, 9.—Phil. i. 11.—Titus ii. 11. 14.

Christ is called the Author of Salvation unto all them that obey him. - Heb. v. 9. - (Captain, in

Heb. ii. 10.)

Rom. xii. 1. must be understood of acceptance on a Christian sooting, from the argument.—and see Rom. xiv. 17, 18. He that in righteousness, &c. "ferveth Christ, is acceptable to God," &c.

Our thanksgiving and praise seem accepted through Christ, Eph. v. 20. – Heb. xiii. 15. – 1 Pet. ii. 5. – And both thanks and services in general, Col. iii. 17.

In Matt. xxv. 40. Acts of beneficence, as they are virtually done to Christ, must, surely, be accepted

by his Father, on his account.

Not to multiply passages, I will only refer to I Cor. xv. 58.— Col. iii. 17, 24. and recommend—2 Pet. i. 11. with what goes before, to considera-

tion; particularly ver. 5.

I conceive this set of texts to be important, on account of their tendency to give our good principles a right direction: to put our virtues upon a right footing; to make us continually act with Chris-

<sup>4</sup> See Homily on Faith, 3d part, latter half.

tian views, and confider ourselves, not as separate individuals, which too many are apt to do, but as connected with other Christians, and with the Head of the Church.

XXII When Faith is commended in Scripture, it is supposed to be productive of good works.

This is expressed in several of the texts quoted under the third proposition; Matt. vii. 23. - Acts xx. 21. - Gal. v. 6. - 1 Tim. i. 19. - Titus iii. 8. - 2 Pet. i. 5. - and in the second chapter of St. James's Epiftle: but our proposition is frequently implied, where it is not expressed. Sometimes the term Faith is not made use of, but some other word, importing much the fame thing. As in I John ii. 3-6. From comparing 1 John v. 1. with I John iii. 9. one may infer, that Faith doth not commit Sin. The Faith spoken of in Heb. xi. may not properly be Christian Faith: of whatever fort it be, it was abundantly productive. Hebr. x. 22 - 24. is to our purpose; because Faith is mentioned as affecting, first the Heart, and then the actions.

xxIII. I here put an end to direct Proof; but it may be proper, as before, to take notice of a few objections.

Is there no impropriety in calling works good, which are acknowledged to be imperfect? I fee not that there is; to speak so, is only to use popular language, which the sacred writers themselves do. Anything may, in such language, be called good, which excites approbation: and all actions are approved, which are better than might have been expected; or as well. As arts advance, we approve

As in St. Paul's account of Abraham's Faith, Rom. iv. 1-3.—See St. James's comment; James ii. 21.

of

prove, what may hereafter difgust us; and the same is true of Morals, and Virtue, or good works. no stage of the progression could it be said, that a man's virtues could, in strictness, justify him; yet one man's conduct is greatly preferable to another man's; and fo may be his condition after death 3. -The Deity may, at any time, accept our crude and imperfect virtue; fomething in the fame way in which a parent accepts a faulty drawing from his child, if it has been done with a good intention, and is tolerable for the youth's time of Life, and opportunities. Such imperfect. unformed, good qualities, a parent accepts as a parent, from a family principle; not as a Judge; or, at most, as a Judge free from feverity. intention must be deemed the main thing; actions are good as expressing good h affections. God is called "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole Family in heaven and earth are named "-(Eph. iii. 15.) and Christians are sometimes called Brethren of Christ .- (Heb. ii. 11.)

posed by Dr. Priestley. Some, he says, define Faith by its effects."—" In figurative language, which conveys no determinate ideas, and therefore leaves the mind in great uncertainty, whether it be possessed of it or not." This seems to be an objection levelled at several of the reformed churches.—As to ourselves, we have given a plain definition of Faith, free from any figure, metaphor, or comparison; nor did our definition turn upon the effects of Faith. We have, indeed, spoken of its effects as

f Homo homini quid præstat! TER.

Ludlam's Fifth Effay, p. 14.

h Ludlam, Essay vi. p. 33. i Hist. Corr. 1. 264.

k Art. x1. Sect. xv11.

of use in practice, to enable a man to judge, not what saith is, but whether in sact he has the Faith meant in scripture, or not; and, one would think, no method of scrutinizing our principles, would be more agreeable to the Socinians, or tend more to relieve their "uncertainty." We use Virtue also, or the effect of Faith, as an help in judging whether any other man has Faith; at least, so far, as to determine, that no man must be allowed to have Faith, if it produce no good effects.

This method leaves a man in no uncommon uncertainty about his own principles: In order to know whether he has benevolence, loyalty, &c. or deceives himself about them, he must follow the

fame course.

It is true our Article compares Faith to a fruittree, and good works to the fruit; but there feems to be high authority for fuch a comparison; as it is made repeatedly by our Saviour himself. vegetable, or vegetative life, answers to the principle, and the fruit to the conduct arising from that principle. The intention of the compilers of our Article in adopting this comparison, seems visible enough; it is to convict hypocrites of difingenuoulness; and the fimilitude proves, that all, who pretend to faith without being virtuous, are as difingenuous as one who promifed to fend a dog, and fent a dead dog; or a fruit-tree, and fent one cut down, and deprived of all its power of vegetation. -A comparison, so introduced, is an argument; because neither the similarity of the cases can be denied, nor the difingenuousness in the case introduced.

It

<sup>1</sup> Luke vi. 44. referred to in Homily on Faith, third part, p. 34, octavo. — John xv. 2. — See also Matt. vii. 20. — xii. 33. — xv. 13.

It will feldom happen, that we need go deeper than this; yet, to fay the truth, we may fometimes be driven, by obstinate cavilling, to descend one step farther. If a man will not be contented with the rational account now given, but will ftill perfift in faying, you take your idea of Faith, not from Faith itself, but from some effects of what you describe and define; the answer then must be, all active principles, fuch is the confined knowledge of man, may, in some cases, oblige us to have recourse to their effects, merely to describe or define them.—What is Gunpowder? at first we only, in answer, define gunpowder by its ingredients; Nitre, with a little Sulphur and charcoal: this will generally ferve to describe, or define, gunpowder. But suppose you try this composition, and it makes no explosion?—then you fay, immediately, this is not right gunpowder: what? did it not answer to your definition? I do not care how it was mixed, fays a plain man, but I am fure, that is not right gunpowder, which will not go off when you touch it with fire. And some inquisitive spectators might go farther, and fay, perhaps the nitre was not right nitre, nor the fulphur right fulphur, &c. and then our difficulties multiply upon us. Here is, no doubt, a perplexity; we have not determinate ideas; but yet the perplexity is one, under which we should make ourselves very easy, as a matter of speculation; and for practice, we should contrive the best methods we could, to cure our gunpowder; but we should never rest contented till it had its Nor is there any good reason why usual effects. perplexity should occasion greater uneafiness, if we were obliged to quit our definition of Faith, and fay, this is not right faith, because it has not the right effects of Faith.

Z 2

xxv. It

It may be asked, does not the doctrine of our church make virtue to be only of fecondary importance? I may answer in the negative. Under the tenth Article it was shewn, that though Christian virtue is to be ascribed to divine affistance, yet we are not to " wait for that affiftance, but to aim immediately at the best of conduct, with the greatest earnestness.—And under the eleventh it was shewn, that when it is said, we are not justified by our works, it is supposed that we have exerted ourselves, and been diligent to come as near perfection as possible. By Bishop Warburton's account, justification by Faith only, has its very foundation in good works. And how can virtue be better fecured, than by a man's acting from Christian principles? In proving the doctrine as we profess it, we have shewn, that a main end and defign of Christianity, was to restore and improve Virtue.—The other main end is, to effect remission of fins, in order that our improved virtue might be effectual in procuring eternal happiness. The latter may indeed be conceived as comprized in the former.

Can any one mean, that the dignity of virtue is lowered because we cannot be justified by it, but only can do things "pleasing and acceptable to God?" what can be higher in its nature than pleasing God? the all-perfect Being! that Being by whom we were created and redeemed! by whom we are perpetually preserved, and sanctified!
—what ideas and feelings must any one have, to murmur as if his virtue was not sufficiently honoured, when it is capable of effects, which may be described in such a manner!

But

689, quarto.

M Art. x. Sect. xxxv. h Art. x1. Sect. xv111.

Art. x11. Sect. 11. and Div. Leg. Book ix. Vol. 3. page

But lastly, I would ask, will not, after all, our Sentence at the day p of Judgment, depend upon our works? The Scripture declares it will, and therefore it will; but is such declaration agreeable to our theory of Justification by Faith? This is a question, which seems to have occasioned some trouble to several advocates of Justification by Faith only; therefore I will hazard an observation or two upon it.

When it is said, our sentence will depend upon our actions, actions must include the principles or affections, by which they are performed: the same action may proceed from benevolence and selfishness, or oftentation; from piety and hypocrify.

The merits of Christ supply impersection; but impersection admits of degrees; the merits of our Lord do not supply in such a manner as to make all men, who are impersect in very different degrees, to be upon the same footing. I make these two remarks chiefly to prevent our proceeding under the influence of wrong notions.

Faith must produce good works: without recurring to the scriptural proof just' now given, we must think, that, if a man has an honest principle of doing his own part, and an ingenuous confidence in God, it must impell him to action. One cannot conceive such a principle to exist in a Christian, and not to set him upon good works.—

It seems therefore much, or entirely, the same thing, in a general view, whether Faith is to be rewarded,

P Art. x1. Sect. xxv111. and Appendix to Art. x1. Sect. xx1v.

<sup>9</sup> Rom. ii. 6-11. &c.-Matt. xxv. 31-46.

r See Jonathan Edwards on Justification, 95. 101.—Dickinfon's Letters, particularly, p. 315.

<sup>·</sup> Sect. xxii.

rewarded, or Virtue. And any difference will be rather a difference of modes of expression, than of doctrines; rather of words, than things. Nay, if it should sometimes occur, in Scripture, that we are to be rewarded for Faith, and fometimes, that we are to be rewarded for works, there would not necessarily be any inconsistency; any more than there would be in faying, at one time, peace was effected by Bravery and military skill; and, at another, peace was effected by the demolition of a Citadel; or, to keep to morals, in faying, at one time, a man was rewarded for his generofity, and faying, at another, that he was rewarded for his generous actions: whenever one of these things was said, the other would be implied'. Faith is the key to Virtue, and to reward: for it admits men into the fociety, of which Christ is the Head; the natural effect of which is, both to make them virtuous, and to gain a fuperior reward for every particular degree of Virtue. The Key may often imply the treasures, to which it gives admittance.

All then that we have to see is, that it may, on some occasions, be reasonable to use the language, that virtue, or good works, will be rewarded, rather than that Faith will be rewarded. To say, that different degrees of Faith, or of a faithful principle connecting us with Christianity, will be rewarded, cannot be so popular a way of talking, as to say, that men will be rewarded according to their conduct, or morals; this latter is what we continually experience; it falls in with our common notions and apprehensions; and as the sacred

writers

See general elements about partial causes, Introduction to Second Part, Sect. viii. Also Locke's Reasonableness, &c. Works, Vol. 2. p. 630, 631. quoted by Jon. Edwards on Justification, page 125, and Short Desence of Atonement, page 45, Note.

writers suit these, we must expect to find them using such language. A youth binds himself to a master, with a right disposition; how do men try or settle, whether he is a good apprentice? by determining whether he behaves well.

It may be more proper to fay, that works will be rewarded, at the Day of Judgment, than that Faith will; because that Judgment is to be witnessed by men and angels. They cannot discern degrees of Faith, but they may, in some measure, judge of works; at least much better than of Faith: they do it every day.

In the present life, it would be more useful for men to say, and feel, that their actions must come into judgment, and produce their happiness or misery, than that only their Faith would be considered: A man would more easily deceive himself about his Faith, than about his actions; he would not be so good himself, nor do so much good to others, if the trial of his actions did not dwell upon his mind. I do not mean, that a man must never examine his motives; even they will be better examined, if actions are performed in a spirited manner, and so we reason from experiments.

We once spoke of a military spirit as being, in some respects, analogous to Faith. More must not be concluded from illustrations than is intended by them: all we aim at is, to make the thing understood, which we illustrate by comparison; earthly things will not correspond with heavenly, in all particulars.

A man enters into a regiment with a true military spirit, and a sense of honour: the Commander of it performs some great and useful exploits; the regiment, as a body, receives honour; the man is more likely to behave well for being admitted into fuch a body; and more likely to be well rewarded for any particular degree of merit. If indeed he proves a coward, he may be shot; but if he distinguishes himself as a good soldier, he may be rewarded; for what, in such case, would reward be said to be conferred? for his spirit or his actions? it might be for either; but if one was expressed the other would be implied.

In Scripture, it seems most natural to speak of man as to be tried for his actions, when all mankind are in view, and the subject is natural religion: (then expressions should fall in with notions and seelings of all mankind:) but as to be tried for his Faith, when there is a danger of a particular set of men being too proud of some Revelation, and of some holiness presumed to result from it:

—or when they are called into a new society, separated from the world, and made a peculiar people, merely through favour.

Jonathan Edwards describes, the rewarding of good actions, as real; but their "rewardableness" as being a consequence of Justification: that is, after men are justified, by admission into the Christian covenant, one privilege of that Covenant is, that their good actions are proper objects of reward. And the fitness of such a covenant, of our being so justified, arises from hence; that such a covenant will promote Virtue. This may be safe ground; I scarcely feel it firm enough.

The Necessary Doctrine, and other writings which favour Justification by Faith only, speak of the day

<sup>\*</sup> Art. x1. Sect. xxviii.

y On Justification, page 100.

This is a word, which Baxter wishes to use; but it seems to him too far from custom.—Catholic Theology.

<sup>2</sup> See Dickinson's Letters, page 315.

day of Judgment as that day, in which "every man

shall receive accordying to his workes."

xxvi. I will mention no more objections; therefore we now proceed to our Application: confisting, as before, of forms of assent, according to natural religion and revealed; of mutual concessions of contending parties; and of hints relative to Improvements.

On a footing of natural religion, a man might declare fomething not unlike our present Article, in the following terms; referring to what had been

declared before.

'Although my improved conduct cannot but continue imperfect in the fight of God, notwith-ftanding my care to purify my principles, and engage in virtuous affociations; although it be still incapable of expiating my former offences, and of standing a fevere judgment; yet can it scarce sail of being pleasing to my indulgent and merciful heavenly parent: the more so, on account of the measures, which I have taken to improve myself: However, what is the real value of those measures, I can only judge with safety, from my actual improvements.'

xxvII. A Christian might affent in some such

form as this:

'Although, as was before intimated, the better fort of actions which I perform under the Christian covenant, as a member of Christ, that is, from Faith, cannot expiate my past offences, or stand in judgment, supposing God rigidly just and severe: yet, I trust, they are pleasing and acceptable to his goodness; not so much for themselves, as from a regard to my Lord and leader, his beloved Son. Impersect as they are, I must rely on them to hinder me from deceiving myself about my Faith:

I must

I must never imagine, that I possess that facred principle, as I ought to possess it, unless it be continually productive of good affections and virtuous conduct.

We come next to mutual concessions. XXVIII. It is much to be suspected, in disputes on Faith and works, that men have not perfectly understood each others expressions; and that they have not dif-

fered in reality, so much as in appearance c.

The Romanists and Protestants give different accounts, not fo much of the efficacy of Christ's merits, as of the manner in which those merits become effi-The Romanists seem to hold, that our cacious. actions d have real strict merit, but that they receive that merit from Christ: we seem to hold, that our good actions have not any real strict merit, but that they are accepted as if they had, through Christ. Does this amount to more than that they conceive merit to be conferred on our actions here, we at the Day of Judgment? a point perhaps at present beyond our knowledge.

In like manner, though fome fay, that men are justified by Faith and works, and others mention only Faith, yet all these may have much the same meaning; as the latter do not exclude works, but

will even call them necessary.

Even the Methodists, who say such strong things against works, seem, the generality of them at least, to make a good life a necessary s condition of Justification at the last day.

But what is to be faid of the Socinians? do not they reduce all about Justification to mere natural

Religion?

<sup>·</sup> See conclusion of Jonathan Edwards on Justification.

d Rhemish Test. Rom. viii. 18. e Ludlam, Essay v. page 16.

f Jonathan Edwards, p. 97, 98, &c.

Principles and Practices, &c. page 52. 56, of the first Letter.

Religion?—Dr. Priestley affirms, that "nothing is requisite to make men"—" objects of his (God's) favour, but such moral conduct as he has made them capable of;" but then he feems to own, just afterwards, that he cannot "at prefent"—" explain all particular expressions in the Apostolical Epistles, &c." "In time" he hopes to "be able, without any effort or straining, to explain" them all. All we can ask for therefore now is a suspension of hostilities; but what, from an adversary, can be more full to our purpose than such expressions, if we really mean to draw the doctrines of our religion from Scripture?

ject of Improvements: but it feems best to defer that subject till we have examined the thirteenth Article.

b Hift. Corr. 1. 279.



## ARTICLE XIII.

## OF WORKS DONE BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

WORKS done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

1. This Article has so harsh a sound, that I wish to be indulged in a few words by way of Preface to it. Something of the kind of thought, which it contains, feems to be required, in our body of doctrines, as refulting from the preceding Articles. From the ninth Article it appears, that men, as men, are in a state of enmity to God, and that their propensities are such as are likely to carry them into actual fin. From the eleventh and twelfth it appears, that Christians are released from that state of enmity, that they are no longer under condemnation, collectively; that they have affiftance given them for the performance of good actions; and laftly, that, though their better fort of actions are still imperfect, they are accepted as pleasing to the supreme Being, on account of the relation

relation in which the Agents stand to the Head of the Christian Society, who has obeyed and suffered and died for them.—If then men are under displeasure, and even Christian virtues are only accepted through Christ, what must be the consequence with regard to Heathen Virtues? they cannot recommend themselves, on account of the unhappy situation of mere men; they have nothing to recommend them; can they, then, be accepted as pleasing to God? must they not appear to Him faulty and desicient?

If the preceding Articles be right, this confequence feems unavoidable. But then another thing is to be considered:—Sin, of any kind, can only be declared to men, or laid before them, for

two purposes:

1. In order that they may punish it: 2. In order that they may avoid it:

In the present case, we can have no concern with punishing, because we cannot judge of the merits and demerits (" I speak after the manner of men") of the Heathens, in any manner which could qualify us for such a business: we are then to leave the Heathens, properly fo called, to God: "how shall they believe on him, of whom they have not heard?"—we are to receive the notice of the fin mentioned in our Article, as those whose concern is to avoid it .- Thus we fee, that the declarations, which the Article contains, must be supposed to be addressed to those, who are nominal Christians, or who have opportunity of weighing the evidence, which Christianity offers in its own sup-To these alone, indeed, scriptural arguments can be proposed.

Both parties therefore, those who make the declaration of the Article, and those for whom it is made, ought to be Christians, (as Augustin and the Pelagians were); or at least to be within reach of reasonings and representations from Christians.— Indeed scriptural authority may be alledged to those who are not Christians, thus; we Christians affirm such and such things concerning our religion: we have such and such arguments in our savour; we warn you not to neglect to examine those arguments. Dr. Balguy puts this kind of warning with great force in the former part of his ninth Sermon.

I hope these two observations will make us think this thirteenth Article rational and pertinent: nay, it cannot but appear important also, we read a part of Dr. Paley's b Charge; and a few passages out of Dr. Balguy's ninth Sermon, and Mr. Ludlam's Essay on c Justification.

I now proceed to History, Explanation, Proof, Ap-

plication, as usual.

11. History. In the Apostolic Fathers, I do not perceive any expressions, which strongly mark the imperfection of Heathen Virtues. They feem to write to Jewish converts, making use of authorities out of the Old Testament. We have not any thing, that I remember, (but I have not lately read them with care) addressed by them to Heathens as persuafives to conversion. And probably they had not many of those nominal Christians, for whom our Article feems calculated: those whom they had to deal with, would be either real Christians, or professed Heathens. Justin Martyr and Tertullian expose the imperfections of heathen worship and heathen Philosophy, and describe the fuperior worth of Christianity; but what was wanted, in

· Apologia, A. D. 200.

b Page 15. 21, quarto. c Near the end. d Cohortatio ad Græcos, A. D. 140.

in order to draw forth fayings exactly to our purpose, was that kind of person, to whom the writings of the New Testament might be alledged as authority, and who, at the same time, thought heathen principles of morals all that he need cultivate.

The conclusion of Ignatius's eighth Section of his Epistle to the Ephesians, might be read; as also Irenaus's application of Rom. xi. 24. jointly

with John iii. 5, 6. or 1 Cor. xv. 50.

Dr. Nicholls, on this Article, tells us, that Clemens Alexandrinus was the first, who highly extolled heathen virtues and heathen Philosophers. It appears to me, from the passages produced, that Clement did not mean anything inconfiftent with our doctrine: that he meant only to justify the ways of God to man; or to illustrate revealed truths. uses expressions more strong than could have been prudently used after controversy was started; such as, that Philosophers were to Heathens, something analogous to Prophets amongst the Jews; and that Philosophy justified the Heathens; but then he is speaking only of the times before Christ; he was not faying, that the same thing would hold good under Christianity.—Chryfoston was much later; he lived after controversy on our subject had arisen; yet he says, that it was enough for Heathens to know God (meaning that Idolatry must always be bad) but now, (in Chrysostom's time) they ought to know Christ.

This is not commending heathen virtue in comparison of Christian; it is only saying, men should now be Christians, though before the coming

f Veneer quotes this passage, and that from Irenæus Adv. Hær. 5. 10.—Welchman also has these passages, but the student would do best to consult the Fathers themselves.

See Nicholls on the Article.

h A. D. 398.

of Christ they could not be so; God is good at at all times, and to all men; Christians are justified by Faith, but Salvation, such as natural religion bestows, could only be given to Heathens according to their obedience to the law written in their Hearts.—This only amounts to much the same with what Dr. Paley says; "they will be accepted, together with those who are instructed in

the Law, and obey it."

Dr. Nicholls gives, as opposed to these passages from Clement of Alexandria and Chrysostom, some from Cyprian and Jerom. They fay, that heathen Virtues are not, or might not be, right virtues; as, for instance, heathen patience was, or might be, apathy, stupidity, &c.; -heathen fortitude, rashness; heathen prudence, cunning; and so on; " I only mean to shew the general nature of the remark. Let us be chafte, fays ferom, by Faith; that is on Christian principles; and, in like manner, wise, brave, temperate. This I take to be exceeding good fense; and worthy of our most attentive observation. It might be partly the result of experience; but we can fee, that the bravery of a robber only enhances the injury he commits. If all the virtues of human life were performed from Faith, meaning the Christian principle of action, the man who performed them, would approach much nearer to the character of the Aixaios, or perfectly virtuous° man, than any one who attempted the fame on Heathen principles: and this

k Rom. ii. 15. Charge, page 17.

m Cyprian, A. D. 248. de con. patient.—Jerom, A. D. 392. on Gal. iii.

n Augustin mentions the prudence of the avaritious, with a reference to Hor Ep. 1. 1. "per mare," &c.—The justice and fortitude (Cardinal virtues) of Catiline, with a reference to Sallust's account of him.

<sup>·</sup> Art. x1. Sect. x1v.

Fathers had, when they used the expression of the Prophet, several times quoted in the New Testament, "the Just, dixaios, shall live by his Faith:" shall conduct himself through life on that principle. St. Paul seems rather to apply the saying of Habakkuk as meaning, that the Just shall enjoy eternal life through his Faith: his Faith shall save him.—

(Luke vii. 50. or xviii. 42.)

III. I mention next the age of the Pelagian Controversy, the fifth century.—We have seen 9, that the Pelagians were against the doctrine of the necessity of Grace for acting well: in arguing on this doctrine, they' used a plea, which led to the subject now before us. Why, they urged, should we have internal affistance, in order to our performing good actions, when some of the Heathens, who had no fuch help, performed fuch great exploits, and displayed such admirable virtues?they instanced in Fabricius, Fabius, Regulus', Scipio. The orthodox Augustin, always vigilant, replied, that the Heathens were not virtuous as a Christian ought to be; that, if they performed actions good in their kind, they performed them ill; from inferior motives; not with a view to the Glory of God, &c. their conduct, though well meant, was, in strictness, deficient, faulty; nay, confidering the nature of perfect Christian virtue, it might even be called finful: what there was of good in it, might indeed leffen future punishment', or even procure temporal rewards; but could by no means have the effect of Christian

virtue

P Hab. ii. 4.-Rom. i. 17.-Gal. iii. 11.-Heb. x. 38.

<sup>9</sup> Art. x. Sect. v.

Vossii Hist. Pelag. Thesis x. of Lib. 3. part 2.

s Aug. Contra Julianum, Lib. iv. Sect. 17. Ed. Antv.

Vossius, page 677.

VOL. III.

virtue to gain eternal happiness. If that great end could be effected by the Religion of Nature, if mere men could attain to perfect righteousness, then Christ died in vain.

Whoever wishes to examine more minutely into this controversy, may consult Vossius's Historia Pelagiana before-mentioned: the third part of his third book is on this subject, and is entitled, "De virtutibus Gentilium"." I have consulted the fourth Book of Augustin's work contra Julianum, but I do not find myself always satisfied with the reasoning of that great Father, or with his application of texts of Scripture. Dr. Priestley has a short passage, which may be read. I will only add a few expressions from the ancients, which may serve as an History of that particular expression, which seems so harsh, and with which our Article concludes, about heathen virtues having the Nature of Sin.

Jerom concludes his passage on Gal. iii. with these words, "fine quo (Christo) omnis virtus in vitio est." Augustin's says, "illud quod minus est quam debet, ex vitio est."—And, to Julianus, "negare non potes eum peccare qui malè quodlibet facit²."—One might read Vossius's contents of his 12th Thesis, lib. 3, part 3. And under it Bellarmin's account of Augustin's taking Sin in a large sense, as meaning, whatever has not all the persection, of which it is a capable.

ages; and, as the "fchool-authors" are particularly mentioned in this Article, I have before faid,

u See also a little, page 667, Fol.

<sup>\*</sup> Hist. Corr. 1. page 300.

Fp. 29, ad Hieron. quoted by Nicholls on Article xv.

<sup>2</sup> Ad Julianum lib. 4. Sect. 30. Ed. Antv.

<sup>2</sup> Vossius, Fol. p. 680.

Art. 1x. Sect. x1; and Art. x. Sect. x.

that I would here give some account of them .-They have been the admiration, and now feem to be the jest of Europe. I wish, at least, to speak of them without copying the language of any age. - The Scholastici used to mean Rhetoricians, who declaimed d, not about business, but for improvement. They were so oxody, in leifure, as opposed to the hurry of real causes; but the word, from denoting declaiming Rhetoricians, came to fignify Barrifters, or Advocates; yet it seems to have had its primitive meaning when Charlemagne instituted Seminaries of Learning, in Monasteries and Cathedrals, and Schools properly so called: only the Scholastici extended the subject of their instructions to Philosophy; which they refined and made complex by eagerly improving one another, and especially by commenting upon Aristotle : and then they mixed this Philosophy with Christianity; applying it particularly to the set of subjects now before us. A very subtle Logic was necessary, in order to carry on very fubtle disputes in Metaphysics.

I have mentioned Charlemagne, who died A. D. 814, at the age of 72; but the origin of scholastic divinity, like that of other things which sprang up in times of ignorance, is very obscure and uncertain. Three periods are mentioned, its Infancy, its Maturity,

See Warburton, quarto, Vol. 3. page 630. - Dr. Balguy,

Those who taught Rhetoric, used, at one time, to be called Sophista: such were Libanius, &c.—Eunapius wrote the Lives of Philosophers and Sophists.—Sophist is sometimes an Artist, in almost anything; or a Philosopher, &c.

Scholæ Philosophorum. Cic

f Dr. Balguy, page 330.

8 In the Encyclopédie may be found several things here said of the Schoolmen.

Maturity, and its Old Age. Its Infancy may be dated early in the twelfth Century; Lanfranc died in 1089, and Peter Lombard in 1164; and they are faid to have lived in its infancy. Its ripe age may be faid to have begun in the year 1220, and to have continued to the time of Durand of St. Porcian, (who died in the year 1333,) or, we may fay, an hundred years; and its Old age may be faid to have begun from 1320, and to have ended, with Gabriel Biel, in the 15th Century. It might be expected, that a kind of learning much admired, should produce other authors after this time, whilft the admiration continued: -Suarez, who died in 1617, is reckoned a schoolman; he is very voluminous in his comments upon those who went before him.—But it may be as well to mention one or two names, in particular.

Peter Lombard, called Lombard from his being born at Navarre in Lombardy, wrote a small book of Sentences compiled from the Fathers, on different points, in a manner adapted to reconcile their seeming differences: from whence he was called the Master of the Sentences:—The number of solios which have been written upon this book is assonishing; itself only a small quarto. Peter was particularly eminent at Paris; where he was preceptor to the Royal Family, one of whom declined the Archbishopric of Paris in his favour.

We may next mention Thomas, commonly called *Thomas* handle Aquinas, because he was of the noble family of the Counts of Aquino near Naples, which family has produced some famous Generals:

He

h Thomas Aquinas died in the year 1274, at the age of 48; his native place Aquinum was the same as Juvenal's; whence Juvenal is called Aquinas by the writers of his Life: see before, Art. x. Sect. x. — See also the third Satire of Juvenal, near the end.

He is often called, in books, St. Thomas. He lived in the thirteenth Century, in the middle, or ripe age, of Scholastic learning. He was very highly esteemed, and called at Paris Doctor Angelicus: his Summa Theologiæ is accounted by the Authors of the Encyclopédie (or by some persons, whose judgment they think worth recording), a capital work of its kind; yet they are not reckoned great favourers of Theology, such as it has been in general.—Though he travelled much, and taught every where, and only lived to the age of 48, he has lest works which fill eighteen volumes solio, and which shew such intensity of thought, as to make it very probable, that they were all written with a mind on the full stretch.

Laftly, we may mention Suarez: though he died fo late as 1617, yet I am more inclined to mention him than to dwell longer on the times before him. He was a Spaniard, of Grenada, a Jefuit, a teacher of Theology, and usually reckoned among the Schoolmen, notwithstanding the time in which he lived. We have his works in twentythree volumes folio, abridged by Noel in two volumes folio. He was reckoned to flate opinions well: but, though he wrote against the Reformation, in defence of Popery, yet his book on that subject was burnt at Paris by the common executioner, as encouraging Sedition and Rebellion .-There are five volumes folio of his works, in which are forty-three Differtations, all on the third part of the Summa of Thomas Aquinas.

I will mention no more facts relative to the Schoolmen; but some were necessary as a ground for

<sup>1</sup> Thomas a Becket is also sometimes called St. Thomas.

Durand was Doctor Resolutissimus. One Schoolman was Doctor Irrefragabilis.

fome judgment concerning their merits. My idea is, that they have shewn great intellectual powers, and that they did not run into all their disquisitions without some view to utility; that is, they wanted very nice distinctions, in order to keep their ideas from running together, and in order to explain all the acts of the mind without leaving anything to the judgment of common fense.-Thus all their distinctions might be founded in nature, yet they might be too minute to be really useful:-men may explain a thing, and yet the explanation shall be more burthensome to the mind, than one less full and perfect would be, which left more to the quick operations of reason and fense. If a man was to describe, with the greatest possible minuteness, a common act of vision, he must become very abstruse and hard to understand: If he undertook to describe all the properties of the different furfaces, of which the furface of an human body confifts, he might pass his whole life in the work, and do little good; or, on the whole, do harm.

A man may write with some view to clearing up things, and yet may run into an intolerable multiplicity of words; especially if he runs on in an analytical method, and indulges himself in prejudice and hypothesis. The Categories of Aristotle used to be studied for Bishoprics; any one may now easily form his own judgment on that work from consulting Mr. Harris's Philosophical Ar-

rangements.

I would not have it understood, that I think refearches are to be given up the moment we find ourselves at a loss to perceive particular uses to which they may be applied: if speculation only enlarges the mind, and strengthens its faculties, it may be continued for a time; though only so long as reason and experience dictate that it will be useful upon the whole. As some bodily exercises shew, to our surprize, what the Body is capable of, so may some mental exercises do with regard to the mind; and both may point out the way to improvement. It is not clear to me, that we should at this time have had such reasoning powers as we have, if no great efforts, no passionate exertions,

had been made by the Schoolmen1.

But to proceed with our Hiftory. We may, for anything I recollect, pass on to the age of the Reformation. Let us begin with the Romanists.— Under the eleventh Article<sup>m</sup>, I read a passage from a Popish Historian, in which Luther is introduced as affirming, that "good works," "how good foever they might appear," "were mortal fins."-I suppose Luther must mean good works of Heathens. In the fixth Seffion of the Council of Trent, the seventh Canon anathematizes those, who fay, that all works done before Justification, however performed, are really fins; but the first canon affirms, that no man can be justified either by works of Nature, or of the Law of Moses, without divine Grace by Jesus Christ. (By the way, can those works be otherwise than faulty, by which a man cannot be accounted righteous?) In the decree preceding the Canons, which expresses doctrines, with reasons on which they are grounded, all merit in those, who are candidates for Justification, feems fully disclaimed; in the fifth Chapter, we have "nullis eorum existentibus meritis:" in the eighth, " nihil eorum quæ justificationem præcedunt,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Dr. Waterland gives an idea of the Schoolmen in his account of the Argument à priori; his notion is also mentioned in his life, in the Biographia Britannica.

<sup>m</sup> See Art. x1. Sect. v1. et Du Pin. Compend. Vol. 4. p. 16.

præcedunt, five fides, five opera, ipsam Justificationis Gratiam promeretur." Nor do I see any distinction of merits into different sorts; but it is found in the works of Cardinal "Cajetan, who was a great Ambassador and Divine at the time of the Reformation: and in the Rhemish Testament on Acts x. 2, we find mention of congruity: I imagine what our Church opposes, may be found in this passage; "Such workes as are done before Justification, though they suffise not to salvation, yet be acceptable preparatives of to the Grace of Justification;"—he adds, "such workes preparative come of Grace also; otherwise they could never deserve at God's hand, of congruity, or any otherwise, towards Justification."

The reformed churches in general, I think, agree with the Church of England. In the twentieth Article of the Augustan Confession, we have "nec placent Deo opera secundæ tabulæ, nisi sides accedat, quòd propter Christum placeat hæc inchoata et impersecta obedientia."

Mr. Hume's account might be introduced here, of Cranmer's framing the Articles; Mr. Hume understands our Articles to mean, "that no Heathen, however virtuous, can escape an endless state of the most exquisite misery."

With regard to the Church of England, the Necessary Doctrine does not seem to enter much into our present subject. In the part relating to Good works, it describes moral acts, done without faith in Christ, as what it does not profess to treat of; yet

n This Cardinal's name was Thomas de Vio: he was born at Gaieta (not far from Naples), and was afterwards Bishop there.

o In our tenth Article we have, "cannot turn and prepare himself." See the explanation, Sect. xxv1. of that Article.

P Hume's Hist. 4to. Vol. 3. page 334. 1st Ed. - the passage is quoted by Gilpin, page 159. of his Life of Cranmer.

yet adds, by the way, that they are good in their kind, and fometimes followed with temporal rewards, though not available to the attaining of everlasting life. In our Reformatio Legum, we find an intention to proceed against those, who hold, that by free-will alone, without any other special Grace of Christ, men may live well. In the life of Bishop Ridley, it is observed, that our Homilies deny the value of "those specious works, apparently good, but done without Faith, in opposition to the Anabaptists." The place where this subject is mentioned, is the first part of our Homily on Good Works. In general, I respect, sometimes admire, our Homilies; but I know not whether the expressions on the present subject, are not somewhat too ftrong' for me; though they may be chiefly borrowed from Chrysoftom and Augustin. -Yet the expressions of Jonathan Edwards seem stronger than those of our Homily; he talks of man being "infinitely guilty"-" beheld of God as infinitely the object of his displeasure and wrath, or infinitely hateful in his eyes." And Antinomians must of course be inclined to speak harsh language against the virtues (so called) of mere Baxter, in a Dialogue" in his Catholic Theology, introduces a Libertine or Antinomian, faying, "They (the wicked) must be first made godly, (that is, made Christians;) and the heart renewed, that the Life (or conduct) may be amended."—And "without Faith it is impossible to please God, or do anything which is not abominable to him."—The famous Antinomian Dr. Crispe gave an odd turn to virtue before justification; instead of disputing whether

<sup>9</sup> De Hærefibus, cap. 7. Page 345.

<sup>5</sup> Homily on Good Works, Part 1.

t On Justification, page 31.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Page 258. 260. - See Art. XII. Sect. I. of this.

whether well-meaning men had any title to Justification, he dwelt upon justifying the wicked; as wicked; "while they were in the most desperate devillish condition of all," &c.—this is one way of ending all dispute about men's deserving "Grace of congruity." It may perhaps have been intended, not only to edify and comfort, but (as Bayes says)

to " elevate and furprize."

vi. With regard to the Socinians, we have lately seen, that God's favour is, according to them, to be obtained "in all situations" by moral conduct. The Racovian Catechism affirms, that Justification by Faith has no concern with the times before the coming of Christ.—Mr. Graham holds, that good works are of themselves acceptable to God; but I do not know whether he makes any distinction between works done before Justification and after it.

VII. I may here close my historical remarks,

and proceed to Explanation.

The title is, "Of Works done before Justification:" that is, works done before a person acts as a member of rhe Christian covenant: this will sufficiently appear from what was be said under the twelfth Article, about works which "follow after Justification." Several phrases may express our becoming Christians, because, if all goes on in due course, as planned, several things take place at that time: but we shall come to some of these phrases very soon.—From the title, we pass to the Article.

VIII. " Works"

y Hist. Corr. Vol. 1. p. 279. - Art. x11. Sect. xxv111.

2 Page 212.

b Art. x11. Sect. V111.

<sup>\*</sup> See Geree's Epistle to the Reader; not very far from the end.—Sidney Coll. Library, T-5-38.

<sup>2</sup> See Short Defence of Atonement, page 38.

"Works"-again we ask what kind of works may be here meant? the answer is, the same kind which is called in the tenth Article our own " natural good works;"-the epithet " good" is indeed here omitted; but the same kind of actions must be meant: no one would require to have it declared, that heathen vices are not pleasant to God; or the actions of Heathens in general; without distinction into well and ill-meant. - It feems not improbable, that the epithet "good" has, in this Article, been purposely omitted by the compilers, in order to avoid the seeming contradiction, which there would be in affirming, that good works have undoubtedly the nature of Sin.—If we cannect this Article with the preceding, we fee the two forts of good works, Christian and heathen, compared with each other; the former declared to be pleasing to God, the latter not pleasing: both imperfect in themselves; but the former pleasing " in Christ," the latter not pleasing, because seen only in themselves.

I do not think, that, in strictness, our Article represents heathen good works as displeasing to

God.

ther phrase for before the Grace of Christ"—another phrase for before becoming Christians:—we find this used in the Acts of the Council of Trent, Session vi. Canon 1. it may be preferred here to other equivalent phrases, as opposed to what has been sometimes called the first grace of God; that assistance, which he may have been pleased to give to Heathens.—We have seen something near this phrase as used by Dr. Redman. In Scripture, it

d Art. x. Sect. xxvIII.

c Art. x11. Sect. v1. and places there referred to.

Art. x. Sect. xLIII. from Jortin's fix Dissertations, p. 84.
—See also Art. x. Sect. xIX.

<sup>4</sup> Art. XII. Sect. VI. or Life of Ridley, p. 351.

is well known, the phrase used in our Article occurs; as we conclude our public prayers with, "the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c.—

(2 Cor. end.)

x. " And the Inspiration of his Spirit"-this phrase seems to me equivalent to the last:-there was, no doubt, fome reason for adding it. The "Spirit of Christ," at least, is a scriptural expression. Perhaps Grace might seem too general a word, as meaning Favour, of any kind; help, external as well as internal.—But we can see, that both this phrase and the last give, by intimation, some reason for a doctrine, which may seem harsh; that they tend to take off, or to foften prejudices against As our inability to please God before we become disciples of Christ is the thing to be impreffed, those expressions of scripture, which have the nearest relation to Christ, must be preferable to all others; both in point of propriety and utility. Afterwards, in the fixteenth Article, reeeiving the Holy Ghost is spoken of without any mention of the Spirit being the Spirit of Christ.

Our explanation might be confirmed by comparing the Title of the Article, with the part of it already mentioned: from such a comparison it must appear, that "Works done before Justiscation," must mean the same with, "works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of

his Spirit."

These two phrases, expressing the ratification on God's part, of our admission into Christianity, might seem particularly proper; more proper than Baptism, as the Article is chiefly intended for nominal Christians; that is, for those, who had been baptized, but did not act on principles properly Christian: such persons do works after Baptism,

which are on the same footing of works before Justification; or works after becoming nominal Chris-

tians, and before becoming real Christians.

In different Confessions of Faith, or different authors, we may expect to find this fame thing expressed in a variety of phrases. Persons not yet become real Christians, may be called the unregenerateh, or in Latin, irregenitii, and non-renatik; their flate may be called that before justification, or before Vocation: - or the justified may be called converted1.

In Scripture, we find the fame variety: confult 1 Cor. vi. 11. "-Titus iii. 7. (where our being put into a way of Salvation, is expressed by "Heirs" and " Hope":) - in Eph. ii. 8, we have faved; in Heb. vi. 4. enlightened, (from whence those who had been Catechumens and were completed Christians, used to be called PariZonevos,)-Vocation and called are common,—chosen, or elect.—See Taylor's Key, Chap. vi. or a short expression in Paragraph 167.

All faid against such good works as we have described, must apply to well-meant actions in a state of Apostacy, a fortiori. Works before attaining to a state of Justification must, at least, be as pleafing to God, as works after renouncing fuch

a state.

XI. " Are

h Baxter, Cath. Rel. p. 258.

Vossii Hist. Pel. l. 3. part 3. versus finem.

k Ellis on the Article.

Art. x11. Sect. v111.

Art. XII. Sect. VIII.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Taylor feems to mistake (Key, Chap. vi.) in some degree, when he makes regenerate, &c. &c. apply to all Christians, good and bad; I think some terms are used so as to seem to include the bad, only because it is taken for granted, as a matter of course, that the internal dispositions will answer to the external figns and professions .- Titus iii. 7. " Heirs" - " hope," belong to all Christians in this way.

" Are not pleasant to God"—they not having the property, which make Christian good works pleafing. Of the meaning of the word "pleafant" enough was faid under the twelfth Article.—Perhaps some persons might be willing to allow, that certain actions are not pleasant to God, who would

not call them hateful or offensive to him.

" For a much as they foring not of Faith in Jesus Christ"—here is a particular reason openly affigned, why heathen virtues are not pleafing to God: the consequence is, that, if we thought the same for other reasons, such opinion, though it might be just, would not belong to this Article; -and, if we did not admit this reason, our admitting the opinion upon other reasons would be infufficient.

" Neither do they make men meet to receive XIII. Grace"—the Grace here meant must be the same with that before mentioned, the Grace of Christ, or

that given peculiarly to Christians.

" Meet," fignifies proper, fit: - in Cooper's Thefaurus it is English for aptus; as meeteness is for congruentia; and aptus and congruus are used, seemingly, as fynonymous:-fit implies a fort of coincidence of different things, as of a key with the wards of a lock, and fo does congruus: the fitness of things, which, with some, is the criterion of Virtue, seems the same with congruity or propriety. Cooper lived in the time of our Queen Elizabeth; in the same reign in which our Articles were published.—In fome fense I should think, that a man who meant well, would be more fit to receive Christianity, than one who lived ill; but the idea of the Article feems to be, that a man, by living what might be called well, under natural religion, would not be, on that account, a fit object for God to confer the benefits of Christianity upon, in such sense, that if God

God did not confer Christianity upon him, he might be blamed as missing or overlooking a sit object. If a man is a sit object of charity, some blame is always supposed to rest upon us if we do not relieve him. A sit object of Charity, would, in the language of the Article, be called, one meet to receive Alms.—This observation will be consirmed by the next.

KIV. "Or (as the school-authors say") — this seems to make the expression, "meet to receive Grace," equivalent to that which follows, "deserve grace of congruity:" the one expression popular, the other school-aftic.—The latin does not mention "the School-authors;" instead of, "as the School-authors say," it has, "ut Multi vocant:"—but the

English and Latin are equally authentic.

"Deferve Grace of congruity"—I used to want a comma after "Grace;" the words sounded as if "Grace of congruity," was some kind of Grace, instead of, deserving "Grace, of congruity," being a way of deserving Grace: other people may not have been so simple. A man may deserve any thing either ex condigno, or ex congruo; either of (to use the preposition "of" in the old sense) condignity, or of congruity; that is, either of strict right, or according to all sitness or propriety. A servant deserves his wages ex condigno; he may deserve a support in sickness or old age, ex congruo, "of congruity." Sometimes instead of ex congruo, the phrase,

• Whilst I was revising this for the press, in November 1796, I accidentally met with some popular Sermons on the thirty-nine Articles, by Boys: as I remember, he seemed to want the comma here mentioned.—And I have fancied, that Bp. Burnet did not rightly conceive the meaning of the words under explanation in the present Section; or indeed the meaning of the thirteenth Article at large.

P I do not find this distinction in Peter Lombard; I see it frequently mentioned in Thomas Aquinas's Summa; but I do

not readily find a definition of it.

phrase, "ex proportione," is used; and then some dispenser of rewards and emoluments is conceived to give them in proportion to the merits of different men.

We should consider what idea we have of a man, who does not grant that, which is deserved, "of congruity," as fit, or proper. We certainly always blame such a person: nay, his conduct excites our indignation: we conceive him as denying that, which he would have been compelled to grant, if Laws could have been made to suit all circumstances: and his mean evasion of the spirit of the Laws, by the impersection of the Letter, increases our disapprobation and abhorrence.

xv. "Yea rather"—is best understood by the Latin, imò—nay; the word rather sounds more comparative than it is here. When it is said, that a thing is rather this than that, the meaning may be, that it is not either one or the other; but here the word rather does not prevent the afsertion, which

follows it, from being absolute.

XVI. "For that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done"-here is another reason openly affigned, to which the observation before a made is applicable. Of any particular man, it can scarce be said, that he does things differently from what God has commanded, if he has never received the command, nor had a power of receiving it. In strictness, a servant may do contrary to what his Master has commanded, though he has received no command; has not heard of the orders which were given out; but this must be through ignorance: the servant, in that case, is not thought to be at all concerned with what the Master has ordered. God winks at ignorance, when it is involuntary, though he may reward.

BOOK IV. ART. XIII. SECT. XVII. 383

reward, in the highest degree, those who both know his will and do it.

XVII. "We doubt not but they have the nature

of Sin."

The History of this expression, already given, will ferve, in some fort, for an explanation of it; but fomething must be added.—The same kind of expression has occurred in the ninth Article: concupiscence was said to have the nature of sin, because it comes of fin, and leads to fin: that is, it is diffinguishable from fin, strictly so called.— "We doubt not," - odd as it may feem, this expreffion, and others refembling it, imply fome doubt: we do not use such expressions in things quite free from doubt.

Sin: - apagraver, means, aberrare, to miss a path, or a mark: we may be faid to fin whenever we miss the right path which would lead to the mark; whenever we deviate from Rectitude; though ever fo little. In Hebrew NOT has the same significations; it implies an aim, natural or moral. But when we have continued a while in rectitude, and apostatize from it, no mark is then supposed to be in view; deviating is then expressed by ;-and going beyond bounds, that is, transgressing, is expressed by ywb: whenever we do any of these things, in ever so small a degree, we " fin: mere man, especially as described under the ninth Article, must be continually doing fome of these. - Indeed every one, who falls short of perfect virtue, may be said, in strictness to sin; which in fact every man does;

See Parkhurst's Lexicon under 500.

In English, we use deviating and transgressing in both a natural and moral fense: have we nothing like apagraren? to miss a mark and miss our duty? I have done nothing amiss? is this used chiefly in negative phrases?

for established virtue, though it may approach nearer and nearer to perfect virtue, has, in no country, hitherto reached it; nor perhaps ever may. No wonder we should miss a mark, if we do not see perfectly where it is placed. This gradual progression and advancement towards moral perfection, seems acknowledged by Christianity: as appears from Phil. i. 9, 10.—Phil. iii. 13.—2 Pet. end. Even Christian virtues have, in themselves, "the nature of Sin," for they are confessedly impersect; only they are accepted through Christ, (as before, Sect. VIII.)

Some fins are called venial\* fins: fome actions, owned wrong in certain respects, are rewarded.—
If you saw a child pick a pocket, though he thought little or no harm, you would own the action had "the nature of Sin;" and would influence him to desist from such conduct. Cyrus's giving the longer cloak to the taller boy, had the nature of sin: and so had the Spartan's exposing his child, and the American's destroying his Parent.—Every action is rewarded according to rules of established virtue, however faulty.

Indeed the Sin, of which heathen virtues have the nature, cannot be fin of every kind; it can only confift of abuses of the moral faculty. Actions well intended, cannot be wrong but by some wrongness in that faculty. Well-meaning men will often be wrongly informed "concerning the nature and consequences of human actions;" they will often have wrong "objects of approbation

an

<sup>\* 1</sup> John v. 17. Es er apagrez & weos Sararor.

Xen. Cyrop. Book 1. page 24. 8vo.

Robertson's History of America. The custom of destroying an infirm child, with religious ceremonies, is still prevalent in the East Indies.

and disapprobation;" and will often approve and disapprove in wrong degrees; either too much or too little. In any of these cases, their actions have the nature of sin;—but if any one reslects, that these are the kind of faults, of which our Article treats, he will not feel much shocked at its

harshness.

While men continue under the influence of a misinformed or perverted moral faculty, even involuntarily, their actions may be said to have the nature of sin, however God may be pleased to accept their Persons; but, if they continue in such a state voluntarily, when they might avoid it, their case must be much worse: and we have supposed our Article to be, properly, aimed at such. Considering what has been done and suffered, in order to make men act on Christian principles, resusing to act upon them, is not only presumption, perverseness, and rebellion, but hardness of heart and ingratitude.

Let then the brilliant actions of the Heathens be applauded, when such applause will best warm the human heart to virtue; but the real nature of their impersection must be fully exposed, whenever the applause due to them makes men negligent of higher and purer principles than those on which they were performed. But we must not forget, that we are now only explaining: however let

our explanation close here.

The matter of the Article may be divided into three propositions, which need not be proved very fully, this Article being a Corollary from the ninth and two following; as was shewn at the opening of it.

1. Christians

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Dr. Balguy's M. S. Heads of Lectures in Morality, Part 3. Chap. 2.

1. Christians ought not to consider Heathen virtues as, in strictness, pleasing to God; because such virtues have not that right Christian principle to recommend them, which is intended for all mankind.

2. Good actions, popularly so called, of men not yet admitted into Christianity, cannot entitle them, even on a footing of propriety, to such divine assistance, as may effect their admission.

3. The good actions of mere men, who have no connexion with Christianity, may, in strictness, be considered as having the nature of sin; because they do not answer perfectly to the Will, or to the Laws of God.

Reasons make part of the propositions, according to what was laid down in the Explanation.

It will be owned, that while we are speaking of strictness, those actions which have the nature of sin, cannot, in themselves, be pleasing to God; therefore if we prove the third proposition, the sirst will be proved of course. And in the explanation of the word "pleasant" (Sect. x1.) we have already given the reason suggested by the twelfth Article; and have spoken to the same purpose in the Presace to this Article. Only we may keep in mind, that, as Christianity is intended for all mankind, it must seem a failure, and be, if one may so speak, a kind of disappointment, whenever men are not influenced, in their actions, by a Christian principle. Let us now take the second proposition.

xx. Good actions, popularly so called, of men not yet admitted into Christianity, cannot entitle them, even on a footing of propriety, to such divine assistance as may effect their admission.

The benefits of the Christian covenant are always represented in Scripture as matter of mere favour: this has been sufficiently shewn before; Taylor hews it more at large. On a footing of common reason, one may say, that, if good actions, performed under natural religion, can claim any reward, they can only claim the rewards of natural religion: furely not an eternity d of supreme happiness.

Again, to fay that a man deferves any thing, is the same thing as to say, if he has it not, the perfon, from whom he deserves it, is unjust, or acts improperly: shall God be considered as culpable because he does not bestow inestimable blessings on certain imperfect moral agents? nay, because he does not befrow them on some, who might obtain them, by observing the gracious conditions

which he is pleafed to propose!

The good actions of mere men, who have no connexion with Christianity, may, in strictness, be confidered as having the Nature of Sin: because they do not answer perfectly to the Will, or to the Laws of God. If the ninth Article is just, this proposition must be so too: If men are all, as men, concluded under fin, their actions must have the nature of fin: and what was faid of the Opennua sagnos not being subject to the Law of God, must still hold good g. Indeed it was scarcely possible to explain what was meant by Heathen Virtues having the Nature of Sin, without giving reasons for our present proposition: only we may now add, that

Art. x1 Sect. xx111.

Key-prefixed to Romans, Par. 167-169. page 58.
Art. XII. Sect. XIX. - Warburton Div. Leg. Book ix. page 630, quarto.

c Gal. iii. 22. Rom. viii. 7. Art. 1x. Sect. xxv1. Life of Bp. Ridley, page 346, from Necessary Doctrine.

the Will of God can be fatisfied with nothing short of perfect virtue: and that his Laws, or commands, must enjoin perfect virtue, though it is by experience that mere man gradually finds them out.

purpose to consider the good actions of those, who are involuntarily mere men, as to take notice of the virtues of those, who are Heathens by choice.—
Yet that their conduct must have the nature of sin, has been halready observed, and indeed is self-evident. Mr. Ludlam concludes his Essay on Justification with some expressions much to our purpose his and Dr. Balguy's ninth discourse is well worth taking into our proof; as well as the part of Dr. Paley's Charge before-mentioned; and the passage of Bishop Warburton's Doctrine of Grace, mentioned at the same time.

Whoever acts from lower motives when he can act from higher, must offend the Deity: this every man does, (we are now taking the divine authority of the Scriptures for granted) who prefers principles merely moral, to Christian principles. It is, no doubt, on many occasions, praise-worthy to act from a desire of esteem, and of feeling satisfied with ourselves; from a sense of honour and decency, from a sentiment of benevolence, or from a veneration for the sanctity of the Laws; but whoever considers the Nature of Christian Faith, must surely regard it as a much higher principle than these; especially when acknowledged as of an original immediately divine: its views take in all time, past and suture; it cannot be exerted with-

out

h Sect. xvII.

I John ix. 41.

k See also page 13.

<sup>1</sup> Sect. 1. where all these are referred to.

m See Diderot's Dedication of his Père de Famille.

The Duellist has, no doubt, some virtuous feelings, of fortitude, abhorrence of injury, and delicacy about reputation; he is willing to brave death in defence of honour: Chivalry made men pitiful and courteous; made them give honour to the woman as to "the weaker veffel;" and whoever has the true spirit of Chivalry possesses some qualities, which are nobly amiable: but, when fine fentiments, or fine qualities, are maintained, or applied, in a manner differing widely from that, which "God hath willed and commanded," they have not the effects of Virtue; nay, may be confidered as faulty, in themselves, or as having the nature of Sin.

Though this may be a fufficient proof of our proposition, I would wish not to close it without a few passages of Scripture: the more, as some texts are used, even by Augustin himself, which do not feem to me, to have weight in the prefent queftion.-Heb. xi. 6. feems to relate to natural religion 9, and to imply, that no Christian can reasonably object to Faith being made the principle of Christianity, because it must be the principle of all religion. Rom. xiv. 23. appears, from the context, to mean, that, in doubtful cases, it is wrong to do any thing which one thinks wrong, though it may be right for another to do the same thing if he things it right: and Titus i. 15. feems to express much the same thought; all things are innocent, generally speaking, in him who, from habit,

º 1 Pet. iii. 7. n 1 Pet. iii. 8.

P Ad Julianum, lib. iv. Sect. xxiv. Edit. Antv.

<sup>1</sup> Art. x. Sect. xx 1x. & Art. x1. Sect. 11.

habit, acts innocently; though this, like most general expressions, implies some tacit limitations; elfe indeed, in this fenfe, it would rather make

against our proposition, than for it.

As these texts are introduced with a view to eating things, indifferent by nature, they should not be understood without some reference to that; though it be a general fact, that a good mind is fo far a compound of good purposes, that a good man acts well generally without thinking of it; and, in like manner, a bad man acts ill: even when the better principles of a bad man exert themselves, they produce fomething wrong, (like the fortitude of a robber); nay, his moral faculty shews itself in fome perversion or excess. But our present Article does not treat of a bad man, only of a virtuous one.

But I will now produce a few texts, which feem

to have real weight.—Matt. x. 15.

John iii. 17, 18. 36.—John vi. 28, 29.—Acts xvii. 30. for we never are faid to connive at that which is not faulty.—Acts xx. 21.—Rom. i. 18. -1 John iii. 23. and v. 17. where adixia "unrighteousness" may bet a negation of Sinaioguun, righteousness, or perfect " virtue. Bishop Burnet uses Rom. vii. but the sense of that Chapter does not feem agreed upon.

If it be proper to take in actions done in a state of Apostacy, we must add, Heb. vi. 4-6. & x. 26.

38. and xii. 16, 17.

xx111. Having finished our direct proof, we may now propose an objection or two.

xxIv. Some

s 1 John iii. 4. might also be read.

" Art. x1. Sect. xIV.

Rom. viii. 1. implies, that there is condemnation to those who are not in Christ Jesus.

t i Pet. iii. 18. we find Christ called δικαιος (χεισος) υπις εδικων, the just for the unjust.

xxIV. Some will be ready to ask, Is not the doctrine that Heathen virtues have the Nature of Sin, a cruel one, with regard to a great proportion of mankind? And is it not contrary to Rom. ii. 14. 27.?—We might express this more fully, by asking, Can the unshaken honesty of Aristides have the nature of fin? or his patriotic co-operation with his enemies for the public good? what shall we fay of the unremitting beneficence of Titus? or the youthful continence of Scipio? - When the pious daughter fed her ancient parent from her breast, was not the act pleasing to our father who is in heaven? But what shall we fay of Socrates! who almost copied by anticipation him, whom we have for an' example.? who laboured to bring life and immortality to light, who fuffered in the cause of pure religion; and who employed his last hours in speaking favourably to his accusers? to those, through whom he suffered an unjust Death? The answer is; this objection relates to those, who were Heathens unavoidably; you fay, that virtuous Heathens, who were Heathens involuntarily, will be happy: I do not fay they will not y: may they be happy !- fome parts of scripture feem to fay, that men shall not be condemned for being Heathens, who have not heard of the Gospel; how much they may a miss I know not; nor is it my business to determine: but they may miss Christian Salvation. Actions may be wronge, and yet the Agents may be made happy. We men

x Notice should be taken of 1 Cor. v. 13. that God is the judge of Heathen virtue, and on his judgment all may rest fecure.

y 1 Pet. ii. 21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>y</sup> 1 Pet. 11. 21. <sup>z</sup> Mark xvi. 15, 16.—Rom. x. 14. Rom. x. 13.

c Sect. xvII.

fay, of one another, sometimes, 'what that man did, was not the right thing; it was not the etiquette, it was not attentive, &c. but the man meant no harm, I like the man; had one done the same, who had enjoyed more advantages and opportunities, I should have certainly resented it:' in like manner, might not the Deity take notice, that Heathen worship is Idolatry, &c. that every sin however rup into, makes confusion, and retards the advancement of the general happiness; but that a Parent a may accept what a Judge might not pardon?

Most thinking men seem to allow, that natural virtue may meet with some rewards; and why may not the benefits of the Christian Sacrifice, of "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world," extend, in some degree, to those, who lived virtuously

before the Incarnation of Christ?

St. Paul says, (Rom. ii. 14. 27.)—"When the Gentiles, which have not the Law, do by nature, the things contained in the Law, these, having not the Law, are a law unto themselves." And he tells the Jews, that the Gentiles, if they suffil the Law, shall judge them. But it does not seem to be plainly affirmed, either that the Gentiles have a perfect law, or that they act perfectly up to that law, which they have: they were "a law unto themselves;"—but would that be a perfect law? they acted conformably to it in some things, and "when" they did so, they were to be commended; and they then judged the Jews, as any ignorant good man judges any learned wicked man:—Sodom and Gomorrah

d Art. x11. Sect. xx111.

e Sect. 111. about Augustin, and Art. x11. Sect. x1x. about Warburton; and Art. x111. about Necessary Doctrine Sect. v.

f 1 Pet. i. 19, 20.—Rev. xiii. S.

tion

Gomorrah were preferable to those, who rejected facred truth; that is, who chose to act on lower principles than they might have had to act upon; but Sodom and Gomorrah were not spotless; nor even accepted by God in his mercy.—Dr. Balguy speaks not as if he thought the Gentiles certainly blameless, on account of St. Paul's saying, when they do the things contained in the law; though he speaks indulgently; "When they, who are strangers to the Gospel of Christ, fulfil the precepts of the Gospel, they will doubtless, in some degree, be intitled to its privileges, and share in its rewards."

frange that Christians should be required to superfede the finer principles of human action?—I do not see, that they are required to do so: I do not understand, that men, by becoming Christians, cease to be men: they acquire a new ruling principle, as men do in every new state, but every ordinary principle may co-operate with it. The Christian principle must be the supreme; but every principle of Virtue may act, in subordination to it.

According to what was before observed, from the ancient Father, let us be just, prudent, brave, temperate, by Faith.—Compare Phil. iv. 8, with the principles before enumerated, and no material difference will be found. In other parts of Scripture, inferior motives to virtue are occasionally recommended, though no where insisted on as new.—Praise is proposed as an incitement; the powers of Conscience are described; and Jesus himself is faid to have increased in favour. In each condi-

Matt. x. 15 .- Dr. Balguy, page 158, alludes to this.

h Sect. 11. Sect. xx11.

k Rom. xiii. 3. - 1 Pet. ii. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xiv. 2.- John viii. 9.- Rom. ii. 15.-Heb. xiii. 18.

m Luke ii. 52.

with it, fecondary principles mix and affimilate; the justice of the foldier mixes with his ruling principle of henour, and becomes more noble than the felfish and niggardly honesty of the lower tradesman or mechanic. Suppose then honour, decency, love of order, harmony, beauty, to be in a Christian mind; would they degenerate? God sorbid! no soil could suit them better.

In fact, I rather fear, that some, whose minds have been intent upon the higher parts of Religion, whose devout affections have been much inflamed, have neglected the plainer moral duties: but this only shews, that all our affections must be guided by reason and conscience"; such neglect is wilful, and blameable; but no more to be laid to the charge of Christianity, than the fanatical sollies of the Crusaders, or the pious cruelties of the

Inquisition.

. Acts x. 35.

axvi. In the last place, something, for the sake of illustration, may be supposed to be objected to that part of our Article, which declares, that heathen virtues do not deserve admission into Christianity. Let then the case of Cornelius be proposed, as it seems to be a sort of standing objection. Was not Cornelius made a Christian because he feared God, and worked righteousness?—I look upon it, that the sacred Historian certainly meant to commend, as well as to record, his virtues; and it does not seem inconsistent with any thing which has been said, to suppose, that those virtues might be, in some measure, the occa-

n Here is an appearance of giving supremacy to both Faith and Conscience; but they are supreme in different ways; Faith, as an active principle, Conscience as judicial. Faith is a Commander, Conscience a Judge.

fion of God's dispensation to the Gentiles originating from him: nay, might be a personal recommenaation 9: In conferring benefits, you may prefer a man for his moral worth, and yet the benefits you confer may be wholly gratuitous. You may leave your fortune to one, whom you prefer on account of his good character, and yet his virtues may give him no claim, of any fort, to your kindness.—The proper question to be asked is, would God have been culpable, or would he have acted improperly to Cornelius, if he had not affifted in his conversion?-Every one must be too much shocked with the question to think any answer necessary.— The Alms of the worthy Centurion would have brought in good interest, if they could have purchased a title to eternal happiness!—And, if blame would have fallen on the all pure and perfect Being for not admitting Cornelius into the Christian covenant, it must now fall on him for every Heathen, equally worthy with Cornelius, who continues in Heathenism.

xxvII. I will not propose any more objections, but proceed immediately to our Application, confisting of the same parts as before.

On a footing of natural religion, a man might, referring to his former declations, say something of

this fort;

'I am now in an improved state; if my improved actions are only pleasing to God, in any degree, because they are recommended by the measures which I have taken, I ought to consider my unimproved actions as not pleasing in his sight. I thank Providence for the opportunities afforded me; they were wholly gratuitous and unmerited; if I

P See Ludlam's 5th Essay, page 15.

<sup>4</sup> Art. x. Sect. xxvIII.

Art. XIII. Sect. XIV. end.

396 BOOK IV. ART. XIII. SECT. XXVIII. XXIX.

now content myself with such virtues as I practiced before I enjoyed them, my best actions must be worse than they need be; their imperfections must on that account become less excuseable; though, in truth, if I conceive what they would be, supposing God to express his perfect will, and publish his all pure commands without reserve, I may fairly say, that, in their present state, they, at best, are not only imperfect, but faulty.

xxvIII. On principles of Christianity the de-

claration might run thus;

' If the virtues I practise since I became a Christian, are only acceptable to God in Christ, those which I practifed before, ought now to be looked upon, by me, as not acceptable; for want of something out of themselves to recommend them .-That they should give me any claim to the tranfcendant benefits of Christianity, it is absurd to suppose: those benefits are mere matter of favour; nor could I have blamed any one, if they had not been conferred upon me. Now I am a Christian, my righteousness must exceed that of my natural state; nay, I must constantly keep in mind, that my virtues (as they would be called) in that state, having no way to get rid of their faults and imperfections, must, in the eye of the all perfect Being, appear to have the nature of Sin.'

xxix. With a view to mutual concessions, we must consider with whom we have any difference of opinion on the subject of our present Article. We may have dispute with those, who are shocked at our seeming to deny Salvation to Heathens', with Romanists, and lastly, with all those, who lightly esteem our notions of acting as Christians; be they called Pelagians, or Socinians; or be

See Sect. v. about Mr. Hume, &c.

be they, without name, only nominal Christians, or unbelievers.

With regard to those, who condemn our feeming rigour to Heathens, I should hope we had made them fufficient concessions, under the first objection, to prevent any dispute. - And the Romanists. I should hope, would be contented with what we have faid in our explanation. I do suppose, that Luther, in opposing error, had expressed himself too ftrongly; but our church is always moderate and rational: to convince all moderate and rational men of that, she need but be rightly understood .-As to the third class of adversaries, who content themselves with acting as what they would call virtuous men, without acting as Christians, to them we have no concessions to make: we have reasoned with them in order to make them acknowledge. that it cannot be an indifferent matter whether such a dispensation as the Christian is neglected or not; and in the preceding Article we gave a pretty copious account of the texts, which mark out true Christians as united to their head, and as acting in the capacity of members. Here we must rest the matter: the affair is as much practical as speculative.

of improvements. It seems as if the language of the Article might be made more perspicuous; and, perhaps, if the Scholastic expression were now omitted, no great harm would ensue; though it does refer to certain remarks made by our adversaries.—The construction also of the Article seems as if it might admit of some Improvement; as the middle proposition, about meriting Grace, separates two, which are nearly alike in meaning.

But the improvements of the Article are not so important as those to which it leads.

It tends to make men act as Christians: to relieve them from the state of criminals in the sight of God, and to set them in the light of adopted Sons: to make the idea of what Christ taught, did, suffered; of the Society which he formed, and continually supports, not only an idea acknowledged, like others, when particularly attended to; but the ground of their habitual purposes, views, and behaviour.

It unites the Christian with the man; revealed religion with natural. It arranges things so, that Faith shall have the superiority intended it; but that Reason, Conscience, love of praise, and every finer sentiment of the human mind, shall have free scope,

and full encouragement.

It effects that, in the natural connection, sometimes rivalship, between virtue and religion, neither shall be neglected; and, by pointing out the manner in which their provinces may be defined, it prevents them from interfering with each other, so as to cause confusion. Affording to virtue the office of a guide; and making Religion to act as a motive, or incitement; so that religion shall not degenerate into blind zeal, nor virtue into cold worldly selfishness.

All things feem in progression; I will conclude this Article with submitting to your consideration two passages of scripture, as pointing out the way to improvement, the one in Virtue, and the other in Religion.—Phil. i. 10. seems to acknowledge the gradual improvement of our moral faculties; join to it the preceding verse, and that which follows it, and consider them all together. 1. We have Ayann, now most usually called Benevolence, the source of good actions: this must produce much praiseworthy conduct; but it may grow wild and disorderly. 2. We have next, therefore, encrowers, a knowledge

t See Dr. Balguy, page 204.

knowledge of "the nature and confequences of human " actions."-This may occasion too great coldness; we have therefore, 3. In the third place, aironnis, an improved fenfibility. These together may generate a right moral faculty; εις το δικιμαζειν ήμας τα διαΦερουτα, fo that we " may approve things that are excellent." When we have got fo far, we must be aware of hypocrify and felf-deceit; fincerity is then important, and an inoffensive disposition: we must aim at being ειλικρινείς και απροσκοποι: -let the difposition, thus formed, then proceed to action: our good qualities, whether respectable or amiable, will grow upon us, and produce fruits in abundance, both of natural virtue, and Christian righteousness; we shall be ωεπληρωμενοι καρπων δικαιοσυνης των δια Ιησέ Xp158: and, at last, our character will assume a celebrity, and will flourish sis dogav xas επαινου Θέν .-Let any one make this the subject of a Sermon: I never yet have; but it could not fail to produce a discourse interesting to all rational Christians.

The paffage, pointing out the way to improvement in Religion, is the conclusion of St. Peter's

second Epistle.

"Grow in Grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."—On this I have discoursed before this University.

" Dr. Balguy's MS. Heads of Moral Lectures, Part 3. Chap. 2. referred to before, Sect. xvII.

## ARTICLE XIV.

OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

VOLUNTARY Works besides, over and above God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

In the History of this Article need not be long; especially as the subject of it is so connected with the subjects of the twenty-second Article.—
The Romanists wish to find something of the notion of Supererogation in the fifth Century, particularly in the works of Augustin; but what he says wants one essential, the transfer of merits. Bishop Porteus, in his brief consutation of Popery, extracted, in a good measure, from Archbishop Secker, (Part ii. Chap. viii.), says, that Indulgences, except as mitigations of Ecclesiastical censures, were not "known for at least 600 years, perhaps much longer;"—Works of Supererogation might be much longer still before they were definitely taught. I have a memorandum of their appearance.

ing first in the twelfth Century; that Century, in which the Popes established their Sovereignty; and in which the remission of certain sins was reserved to the Pope and Bishops; but, when I looked last into Forbes, he did not give me a distinct idea on this head:—I suppose distinct knowledge is not easy to be had, and the matter is not important; so I am not accurate about it. Mosheim places the rise of the doctrine of Supererogation in the thirteenth Century, which will be authority enough for us.

The principal thing to be observed is, that the Romanists spoke of Christ as having suffered, (independently, I think, of the redemption of mankind) more than he needed to have fuffered, and therefore part of his merits might, according to them, be confidered as laid up in a treasury:-Now in whose disposal should this treafure be, but in that of the Church? and who should act for the Church, but its earthly Head, the Pope?—But not only Christ had a superabundance of merit, but some of the most eminent of the Saints; they might have enjoyed this world innocently; therefore all their felf-denial and voluntary fuffering, was fo much more than innocence; it was merit; and merit which might be transferred to poor ordinary, finful Christians: fuch was the merit of performing acts of supererogation.

The spiritual treasury of merits, thus amassed, was sometimes said not to have the power of delivering from eternal punishment, but only from that temporary Purgatory, of which we shall have occasion to speak something hereaster; yet it is

Dupin's Compendium, 12th Cent last chapter.

See 13th Cent. Part 2. Chap. 3. Sect. 1.—or octavo, Vol. 3. page 242.

Under the twenty-second Article.

thought, that, in the minds of the common people, eternal punishment and temporary, being both after death, were fometimes confounded; and that fuch confusion was rather encouraged .- But how was any one to get any of this treasure to be applied for his own benefit? by Charity, either done in his life-time, or by will; "Charity fhall cover the multitude of fins;" charitable bequests must by no means be discouraged; they would generally be larger than charitable prefents; some expedients must be found to make them efficacious: Here was great scope for traffic, or fale of spiritual goods for temporal; and the abuses run into were fo great, as to occasion the beginning of the Reformation: the Council of Trent itself made decrees against them: yet candour must remember, that the gains arifing were not applied to the enriching of private individuals; chiefly to the enriching of some religious Order: and fome, probably, to advancing the honour of Religion.

The Council of Trent seems to avoid the term Supererogation, though it calls Indulgences "cælestes Ecclesiæf Thesauros."—This conduct savours the idea, that the Romish Church rather wishes to have the doctrine of Supererogation believed by the people, than precisely taught to all men of improved minds.—The Rhemish Testament, which was intended for those who understood English and not Latin, speaks plainly. "Holy Sainctes, or other vertuous persons, may in measure and proportion of other mens necessities and deservings, allotte unto them, as well the supererogation of their spiritual workes, as those that abound in worldly

d See Bishop Porteus, Part 2. Chap. 8.

e 1 Pet. iv. 8.

goods,

f End of twenty-first Session.

<sup>8</sup> On 2 Cor. viii. 14. and fee Index, under Works and Counsels.

goods, may give almes of their superfluities, to them which are in necessitie."-The necessary doctrine feems to have adopted reformed notions in this particular; for here Reformation began; it uses the text, (Luke xvii. 10.) which is in our Article; and exhorts men to keep continually advancing in virtue; and represents them, the farther they advance, as being the more indebted to God for his Grace, which enabled them to advance. It also represents our duties as being enjoined, not for any benefit to God, but merely for our own b good .-The third part of our Homily on Good Works, turns to ridicule the Lamps always running over, the markets of merits, the works of overflowing abundance, of supererogating Papists: and by so doing, shews how necessary it was, at the time of the Reformation, to expose the corrupt practices and superstitions of the Romish Church, to the People; and to declare against such corruptions in the new body of doctrines.

As the subject of works of supererogation is intimately connected with the subjects of Article xx11, you may ask, why is it placed here? Because it is in the midst of Articles, which shew the absurdity of it; and even on the principles of the Romanists themselves. It relates to the actions of individuals, and to their being accepted

and rewarded by the Deity.

We may now proceed to explanation. chief thing to be explained is the title, " Of works of supererogation."—Rogare legem, is to propose a law, or ask the people whether it may proceed: Erogare, is properly to make a law, or an order, for paying any fum out of a public treasury; but

h Of good works; not very far from the end: the pages are not numbered.

the word is used also for paying, or laying out. -In Luke x. 35, weordanavaw, to spend over and above, is translated, in the Vulgate, by supererogo; which, as one fingle word, does not feem pefectly classical, though it might be really in use at Rome; but that is the case with several expressions, taken from common life, which are found in the Vulgate'. Now here are two alls of beneficence mentioned, as done by the good Samaritan; one definite, the other indefinite; the definite, giving two denarii; the indefinite, faying, " what soever thou spendest more, quodcunque supererogaveris, when I come again I will repay thee."—The Fathers, in pressing duties, determinate and indeterminate, though not belonging to acts of beneficence, had sometimes recourse to this passage of Scripture. I do not wonder at their dwelling on anything fo excellent; they would compare definite commands, or prohibitions, to the two pence's; and things left to expedience, to the unlimited order of the Samaritan: - and fometimes, (perhaps more frequently) any commands, though not very definite, fuch as duo pracepta caritatis, (the love of God and man, I suppose,) to the sum paid, and mere advice, fuch as St. Paul fometimes gives, to the indefinite commission. - Hence the famous distinction of Precepts and Counfels, præcepta et confilia; or commands

Book 1. Chap. 1x. Sect. vIII.

\* See Nicholls on the Article.—I fee in Cave's Hift. Lit. that one part of Fulgentius's 2d Book ad Monimum, is, de S.

Pauli Supererogatione.

Monimus had been puzzled about Augustin's comparison of Paul's advice 1 Cor. vii. 25. to the unlimited commission, "quodcunque supererogaveris," &c.; especially when he compared that comparison with others, arising out of the same passage, by Ambrose and Optatus; he applies to Fulgentius to reconcile them; Fulgentius labours at it; but I have not examined nicely: he says, interpretations will be different; but I find no idea of transferring merit.

commands and advice.—An ordinary good Christian, the notion is, obeys all Precepts; but he must be something great and extraordinary, who aims at Counsels; which are sometimes called evangelical perfections. He who obeys precepts, will have some reward; but he who obeys counsels, will be rewarded much more nobly. He who disobeys precepts (I speak as a Romanist) will be punished; but he who does not comply with Counsels, will suffer no punishment, merely on that account.

I see nothing farther to explain. The word "arrogance" may arise from the idea of man's being sinful, and yet pretending to dispose of the rewards of God; "impiety," from the idea of our being indebted to God, and yet making him, as it were our debtor. Our church says nothing, in this Article, of the merits of Christ; but only of the merit of human creatures."

our *Proof.* I do but perceive one proposition, but it must be framed with a view to the sense of Supererogation at the time when our Article was made:

"which they call works of Supererogation"—call fo, at this time, say our Reformers.

'We may not suppose any one man to have so much merit, that some of it can be transferred to lessen the punishment of another man.'

This

<sup>1</sup> See 1 Cor. vii. 6. 25, 26, 40.—also 2 Cor. viii. 8, 10.—In the Vulgate, de Virginibus autem præceptum Domini non habeos confilium autem do, &c. Counsel is an English word for advice, which cannot be said to be antiquated: Gay says, of Courtiers,

They give you good counsel, themselves to defend.

"Voluntary works besides, over and above," &c. Could one see an instance of this use of the word "besides," in any author about the time of the Reformation? the word besides occurs in Art. xx; but, if it has the same force here as there, it is a preposition as usual, and the words "over and above" are synonymous to it, or explanatory of it.

This might be left as proved by the eleventh. twelfth, and fifteenth Articles. If we are not juftified by works, we cannot be more than justified by them. If our Christian virtues are in themselves imperfect, and are only accepted through Christ, we can have no merits in our disposal. If all men are finners, they want all their merit for themselves, and more than all. In the Lord's prayer, we desire God to forgive us our trespasses. We are commanded to love God with all our heart; to do all to the glory of God; can we do more?-we are bought with ao price; have fuch persons any services to give away? - There is no abiding place, where we may stop as though we were palready perfect, and fay, here I am, I need make no further advancement in virtue; we are to press forward; we are to run fo as to obtain; to frive to enter in at the strait gate. - And, as we must take our idea of works of Supererogation, from the practice of the Romanists at the time of the Reformation, we may reason from the human commandments as censured in the New Testament, in Matt. xv. 9. and Col. ii. 18. 20-23. to the still more foolish and corrupt human commandments of the Romanists; I think our Homily reasons thus with great force'.

IV. The

n Ludlam's 5th Essay, page 10.

o 1 Cor. vi 20. P Phil. iii. 12, 13, 14.

<sup>1</sup> Cor. ix. 24. where the context is in our favour.—See Locke's Paraphrase and Contents.

r Luke xiii. 24.

Although Hammond gives a favourable interpretation of elexologramia, Col. ii. 23, (which it may bear), yet that does not affect the Scope of the passage, Col. ii. 20—23, which is against superstitious restraints on natural Liberty, imposed by man. My idea of the passage, after reading Hammond, is this; If ye be dead with Christ from [Jewish ordinances] worldly elements, why do you dogmatize, as if you still lived in the world [under such slavish ordinances]? [why do you dogmatically

IV. The proofs of the eleventh, twelfth, and fifteenth Articles are proofs of this Article; if, after such proofs, any difficulty remains, it will be best cleared up by answering objections. Bishop Burnet concludes his exposition with saying, "the thing is so plain, that it has no sort of difficulty in it."—But it seems to me, that an acute Romanist might give us some trouble; if not so as to affect our opinion, and hinder our affenting to the Article, yet so as to perplex us about extricating it from all consusion, and setting it clear of snares and entanglements. Let us then suppose such an one to make the following objection:

Can a man do nothing beyond bare duty? is all virtue to be measured by rule and compass? are no noble effusions, no generous exertions, to be encouraged? are we to aim at nothing great, nothing graceful?-It will be more easy to examine these questions, if we proceed methodically; suppose then the objector to say, to the same purpose, take a man, that you would just not blame; cannot another excell him? may not you coolly efteem and like the first, and feel much towards the other; love, approbation, high efteem, admiration? And yet, if the first be innocent, he must have merit enough; has not then the other more than barely enough? and what could he do better with fome of it than transfer it?—A man may have more interest sometimes than he wants for introducing

himfe f

dogmatically enjoin,] touch not, taste not, handle not, [meats, and wines, and women]; all which [prohibitions] turn to corruption, by abuse, [to unnatural indulgences], according to the injunctions and teachings of [superstitious] men; which [abstinences] have an appearance of prudence, in the way of voluntary religion, and humility, and mortification of the Body; but have no real tendency to bring about any honourable [and well-regulated] gratification of the bodily appetites.—This paraphrase will be of use in Art. xxx11. Sect. xv111.

himself to an advantage; he may have interest enough to be able to introduce a friend.

And does not common language shew, that this is common reason?—Praise is not bestowed, nor rewards conferred, on those, who merely perform their duty. And it is so common to say, such a man gave more, or did more than he was under obligation to do, that we must look upon common language, as establishing or implying the distinction between precepts and counsels.

Nay farther, does not Scripture confirm the same thing? does it not make use of praise and reward as incentives? does it not exhort or advise some men to do more than men need do?—as in the case of him, who was to sell all he had and give to the poor:—and of St. Paul, who preached gratis, foregoing the stipend to which he had a right, (for St. Paul's example is to us as exhortation;) and who himself gives counsel, where he will not give precept; to which last instance may be joined the savourable mention of those, who made themselves Eunuchs, for the kingdom of Heaven's sake."

If we can answer this objection satisfactorily, we have nothing more to sear from our present Article: it is partly of a moral nature.—We must allow, that one man may be only just free from blame, yet an object of calm esteem and benevolence, whilst another, who is compared with him, may be much admired: let us give these two characters names; the former is A, the latter is B.

First,

t Matt. xix. 21.-Luke xviii. 22.

u 1 Cor. ix. 12-18. of which Mr. Locke fays, (Contents to Sect. v.) in the person of St. Paul, "I do not content myself with doing barely what is my duty."

x 1 Cor. vii. 25. y Matt. xix. 12.

First, when A and B stand thus compared, A may be really less worthy than B; yet that may not be the reason why he is less admired; nor does it follow, because he is not blamed by man, that he is innocent in the fight of God; in fuch fort, that he must escape punishment: nor, because B is admired, can we infer, that he has any merit to spare. Nor that, if he had, he could transfer it, or any man for him:—But this must be expressed more at large.—The reason why A is not blamed, is, because he does what is prescribed in a definite manner, or performs determinate duties: men find it, generally speaking, inconvenient, or wrong, fometimes impracticable, to blame any who perform those duties, the circumstances of which can be particularly marked and infifted on; hence it is habitual to confine blame to violation of fuch duties:—and, in like manner, it is habitual to praise only the performance of indeterminate duties; it being always evident, that they may be evaded by any one, who wishes to evade them, and wants principles:—add, that if a man performs indeterminate duties, such as beneficence, forgiveness, gratitude, &c. with any danger to himself, or in any unexpected manner, a pleasing wonder heightens moral approbation; fo that, though a man neglected some determinate duties; (for people are often generous, who are not strictly just), yet if he overpowered blame, by the force of these more pleasing sentiments, he might be admired, and applauded.—But though A, the harmless or blameless man, is generally treated as innocent, by man, yet he will not be fo by his own conscience, or by " God the z judge of all," if he neglects indeterminate duties, which he has opportunity of practifing; if he never gives, or forgives: - though therefore fore he may not be blamed by man, he may be punished by God: consequently nothing can be grounded on B's being better than A is; whereas the objector supposed, that A was innocent, or had merit enough, and B more than A. Nor, because B is admired by man, has he therefore any merit to spare; he may be punishable for neglect of determinate duties, or even of indeterminate; -his obedience is imperfect, though it may be firiking; and so he would tell you himself: What military Commander, of real merit, would fay of himself, that he had done more than his duty?—Yet fuch an one might fay of an inferior officer, whose merit was much below his own, that he had done his duty; but this would mean only, that he had done all which could be demanded of him :- it is here worth observing, that language varies, when a man speaks of himself and of others. But, if the obedience of B, the admired character, is confessedly imperfect, if he may be blamed by God, who knows all his circumstances, can he have any merit to spare? - nay, suppose that both A and B get some reward, yet may they not be susceptible of reward in different degrees? and may not God reward them in proportion to their real merits?— When B has got a certain reward, he is not full, incapable of receiving more. - As to a man's having interest to introduce a Friend, that is founded on no general principle: in different cases in common life it depends fo very much upon particular circumstances, that no argument can be deduced from it.

Secondly, though A may be only just not blamed, and B may be admired, yet it is possible A may be as good a man as B, or much better.— Suppose A regular, industrious, frugal, kind to his neighbours in a plain way, not diminishing his power

power of providing for his family; suppose B generous, but beyond his fortune; brave, willing to facrifice any advantages, to encounter any dangers for his fellow-creatures in diffres; A might only just escape blame, and B be generally admired; and yet I should hold A's the better character.-But, suppose A this fort of plain benevolent man, and B a Simeon Stilites : how great then would be the difference in point of admiration in favour of B, (taking a proper age to judge) in point of real worth, in favour of A!-No man, who aims at extraordinary merit, can purfue one thing, without neglecting another: his worth must depend on the value of what he neglects. A canonized Saint has generally left substantial duties to ordinary men; these would be less admired than himself. but might often have much more real worth.

The best plan then is, to set each man on watching what opportunities of doing good his station affords, without neglecting anything, which is really more valuable than what he aims at; and on exerting himself to the utmost in improving such opportunities. As he went forward, he would see perpetually new openings, which would occasion new exertions. How much better is this than turning a man's attention on the misguiding distinction between precepts and counsels! fit only to make men idle or vain!—If men are indolently disposed, the distinction between precepts and counsels.

a See Middleton's free Inquiry, p. 165.—A passage translated from Theodoret.—Suppose a dialogue was composed, after the manner of Lucian, between Simeon Stilites knocking at the gate of heaven, and St. Peter, as porter, keeping the keys of heaven: Simeon might bring our A, and, taking his own admission for granted, desire an inferior place for poor A, on account of his (Simeon's) merits; Peter might examine both; order A to be admitted to a good place, and order Simeon to be kicked down into the nether parts, &c. &c.

fels will make them rest in determinate duties; if more active and ambitious, it will make them arrogant, as if they were doing what even God could

not require.

But our objector refers to common language, with regard to Praise, Reward, and doing more than a man is obliged to do; as favouring the distinction between precepts and counsels: this part of the objection is, in effect, already answered. Praise and reward are not, amongst men, proportioned to real worth; but depend upon what we expect b; which depends upon what we are accustomed to.—We praise nothing that is common, however useful it may be; and how much soever we praised it when it was uncommon: and reward is praise carried into action. We blame a breach of any common rules of conduct, because that is a shock and disappointment to us.

When we fay, a man gave more than he was obliged to give, we generally mean, that he gave more than the petitioner could have demanded, or than the Magistrate could have insisted on. Perhaps a man, of whom we should fay this, did not give so much as he was under obligation to give, in the judgment of God, who knew all his circumstances. If a man wants to have distinct ideas, when he hears it said, such a man gave more than he needed to give; he will always ask, more in

whose judgment?

A man may be conceived to give so much, that God will reward him (Prov. xix. 17.); he may give more, God may reward him more; he may give more still, God may reward him less; because he neglected something, in the last instance, to which he was more strongly obliged. We are to aim at a maximum of good, upon the whole.

Precepts

Precepts and counsels seem only to differ as duties determinate and indeterminate; the general reason why a direction is made a counsel rather than a precept, or an indeterminate duty, rather than a determinate one, is, because circumstances are so variable, that a calculation of them must be lest to the Agent: but this is nothing to the essence of duty; nor to the judgment of God.

It must be owned, that a man is sometimes blamed for neglect of indeterminate duties; but that is when they are very common, and the evasion of them gross. But, even in these cases, they are blamed more by the rash and censorious, than by the candid and considerate: and what is faulty in such blame, is not to be made the ground of

objection here.

We should never forget, that language is secretly guided by convenience, and use. Praise and blame, on that account, as well as on account of what was mentioned before, seldom mark the real worth of actions. Babes in Christ, and 'tis the same in morals, must have milk, and not strong meat. A discreet Pastor thinks what he may blame with success; if he succeeds at first, he will venture farther; and sometimes he finds difficulty; for encouragement makes some men remiss, others it quickens; blame revolts some men, though it corrects others; and the same kind of thing tends to fix the standard of blame and praise in the world at large.

I cannot quit the subject of language without repeating, that, when I am speaking of others, duty means, what I can claim; when of myself, it is,

what I can do.

v. Our

4 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

Introd. to fecond part of the Articles, Sect. IV.

v. Our objector alledges, that Scripture encourages the distinction between precepts and counsels; that is, encourages the notion, that a man may, in many cases, do more than he is obliged to do. To this part of the objection, relating to Scripture, no general answer seems necesfary, except, that the language of Scripture is common language. What is said therefore of praise and reward in Scripture, must be interpreted as it is in common life. The particular instances alledged from Scripture certainly deferve fome answer; -Why our Saviour told the young man, who wished to be his follower, to sell all he had, and give to the poor, I think no man may be able perfectly to fee: the case was evidently extraordinary, and fuch as no man should copy, except he was able to make the proper allowance for difference of circumstances: was any one to do the fame now, he might be "worse than an Infidel." -There is an appearance, that the young man was too fanguine; wanted to undertake what he would not have had the resolution to persist in to the end; this is a temper of youth; and our Saviour might mean to convince him, that he was unfit for what he aimed at; and might require that facrifice of him, without which he would have been a troublesome disciple, if not an Apostate h; -but, if I was to make an hundred conjectures, I should end with faying, that it is not probable that we should see the whole wisdom of our Lord's propofal.—St. Paul preached gratis; but there is no appearance that he thought God was his debtor

f Book 1. Chap. x1. g 1 Tim. v. 8.

e Introd. to second Part, Sect. x11.

h This passage of Scripture is considered again, Art. xxxv ..... Sect. v ..

<sup>1 1</sup> Cor. ix. 12-18,

debtor on that account: having an opportunity of doing credit to the Gospel, he did it; but his reason for speaking of his motives, was, that his disinterestedness was turned against him by a rival party; and he was even said not to be a true. Apostle, because he had not the stipend of one.—Had Paul accepted a stipend, no man would have blamed him; but yet if he had neglected any opportunity of surthering the Gospel, he might have had blame from God, or a less reward.

What belongs to voluntary abstinence from marriage, for the sake of promoting the interests of Religion, may be deferred to the thirty-second Article: the passages are generally urged on our present subject, and therefore are mentioned here; but what is said on other passages may sufficiently, for the present, obviate difficulties relating to them.

Barbeyrac, on Grotius de Jure, &c. 1. 2. 9. has a long note on the distinction between Precepts and Counsels.

vi. The expression, "Charity shall cover the multitude of sins,"—seems to me to mean, that, as all rules of Virtue are only modifications of benevolence, or charity: where we want rules, if we act from the fundamental principle, Benevolence, as well as we can, we shall be excused for any mistakes, which we may run into:—it is probable, that we run into many faults every day; but they are undistinguished faults, unnoticed; the crowd, the herd, "the multitude of sins;" or what the Psalmist calls, our "secret sins," as opposed to such as are "presumptuous."

vii. I will now venture to proceed to our Application; though it does not feem necessary, in treating

Locke on 1 Cor. Section v. Contents.

<sup>1</sup> Pfalm xix. 12, 13.

VOL. III.

treating the present Article, to detain you by forms of assent.

As to mutual concessions, I will read you what Dupin fays " on the Article. There does not feem to be much hope from it". Baxter, in his Catholic Theology, which is all reconciling, declines the attempt to reconcile Papifts and Protestants in those doctrines, which have in view the accumulation of wealth .- Something might poffibly arise from the different fenses, in which we use the word duty, when we speak of ourselves, and others: the popish doctrine is of the duties of others, the Saints; our Article runs in the name of the Agent; and speaks of duties as done to God. - We are by no means against voluntary exertions; we think every fuch exertion will have its adequate reward; -the more the better, fo long as the greatest possible good is aimed at upon the whole; so long as we neglect no stronger obligation for a weaker.

Improvements feem to depend much on fettling, in each case, the comparative worth of ordinary life and extraordinary exertions: and something might result from reducing indeterminate duties to determinate.

Mosheim, Vol. 6. 8vo. page 77, being Append. 3.

n Would not Dupin be tolerably fatisfied by what is here faid; that good Christians must exert themselves beyond what is required, in some sense?

o Inns have reduced the indeterminate duty of Hospitality to a determinate bargain: and services, which might once have canonized a Saint, may now be compensated by the stipend of a missionary.



## ARTICLE XV.

## OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.

CHRIST in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, fin only except; from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who by facrifice of himself once made, should take away the fins of the world: and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

1. We begin, as usual, with History.

There are two subjects in the Article, the purity of Christ, or his perfect freedom from Sin:—and the

finfulness of man.

that the Jews calumniated our Lord, as a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, as a fabbath-breaker and a feditious person; because the character of Christ, with which we are concerned, is that which results from a view of his whole conduct.

Some very ancient Christians have been accused of speaking slightly at least, if not slanderously, of their Lord and Saviour; but, as we have not any of their writings, and those who accuse them,

DD 2

wrote some time after them, generally speaking, and not in the most candid and dispassionate manner, I will not dwell upon opinions so faintly described and impersectly proved. The best account I know of them is in Lardner's posthumous work.—We have before a said, that the Socinians look upon Christ as peccable.

The passage quoted by Welchman from Irenaus, is to our purpose; its original meaning must have been to oppose the Doceta.—Tertullian's passage is rather curious, and particularizes the right kind of sins; allowances being made for difference of manners in different ages and countries: it leads us to the second subject, the sinfulness of man.

111. We pass on to the Pelagians.—In consequence of their flight notions of original fin and divine grace, when the orthodox exclaimed, how finful men are! they extolled the freedom of man's will, and maintained, "that a man may be without fin, "keep God's commandments eafily, if he will."-What they urged in defence of their opinion was fo specious, that it perplexed the mind of Marcellinus, a Nobleman of Carthage, who wrote to Augustin on the subject. Not that this was the only subject, on which he consulted him; we have three books, written by Augustin, De Peccatorum meritis et remissione, et de Baptismo parvulorum, addressed to Marcellinuse; the fecond is to our present purpose, and of that I will read you the contents; and perhaps a paffage or two. Augustin speaks on the same subject in other works; and Jerom in his writings against the Pelagians.

<sup>\*</sup> From Priestley's Letters, page 101.

b Wall's Inf. Bapt. page 166, 4to. from Jerom.—See the original (in Jerom, or) in Append. to tenth Vol. Op. Aug. page 55.—where are many things on this subject, as well as on other parts of Pelagianism.

o Aug. Opera, Vol. 10. beginning. - Argument of 2d Book.

Pelagians.—Leporius, whose recantation we have defined leaned towards the Pelagians. They represented the orthodox as saying, in effect, when they called all men certainly sinful, that the commands of God are impossible; which the Papists charge upon Luther defined as they do the doctrine, "that invincible ignorance is not excuseable;" a doctrine, I fancy, connected with this Article; as making a cause of doing wrong actions, however unavoidable, a species of Sin.

of Session vi. declares against impossibility of keeping God's commands; though in the tenth Canon it says, that men are not formally righteous. The twenty-sisth Canon is against saying, that Christians sin venially, at least, even in their good works: but then it is supposed, that eternal punishment is held to be merited by such venial sin, of itself.—

The account of the Virgin Mary may be noticed; the Romanists reckon her void of sin; Eishop Burnet thinks, the scriptural expressions rather imply some impersection in her:—some have gone so

d See Sirmond's collection, or Opuscula varia.—Gennadius's memorandum prefixed, is more useful than the Recantation itself; which is declamatory, and about several more important things: this Recantation is mentioned in Jortin's 2d Dissertation, page 88.

In the Appendix to the 10th Tom. of Op. Augustini, p. 86, there is a short quotation from this Recantation; from whence it seems, that Leporius's error had been rather on the first subject of this Article, making Christ man in the most extended sense; saying, he bore the suffering as a mere man; without divine help of any kind. This was indeed implying also, that a common man does his difficult duties without divine help.—In Sirmond's Edit. this passage 20.

Dupin's Compend. Hist. Cent. 16. Chap. 6. page 16. and

Berti's compendium, Vol. 2. p. 153, 154.

Trent, Seffion 5, end of decree about original fin,—Rhem, Test. on Col. i. 24.

far, we are told, as to fay, that St. Francis performed every command of God; but as Dupin makes no objection to this Article, we will fay no more of the Church of Rome.

v. The two ideas of finless perfection, which are most to our purpose, may as well be mentioned without regard to time; I mean those of the mystics and Antinomians. So much has been faid of both these sets of Christians beforek, that I may confine myself to the ways, in which they have conceived themselves free from sin. The mystics became free from fin by the intimate union of their fouls with God and Jesus Christ; the Antinomians, by having all their fins laid upon Christ.—The mystical enthufiast does not purposely do any thing which we should call wrong; the Antinomian does things wrong in themselves, but they are right because he, a true Christian, does them; insomuch, that if he was to feal, the crime commonly called theft, would in him lose its criminal nature. But let us fay a word or two about each of these, separately.

Men may be mystics in different degrees; I have been told, from respectable authority, that the Arminian Methodists, known better as disciples of John Wesley, have a class, or rank, or small society, which is called the select band; the members of which are supposed to be in a state of perfection: they do not indeed like to join the word "sinless" with perfection; they like best to say, they are "perfect!

<sup>&</sup>amp; Rogers on the Article.

Mosheim, octavo, Vol. 6, page 77.

i Luther confidered the Papists and Anabaptists, as the Pelagians of his age; and might be too warm against them. And our Article might be intended to soften matters.—See Life of Ridley, page 344, 345, referred to in Art. x111, Sect. v.

Ridley, page 344, 345, referred to in Art. x111. Sect. v. Book 111. Chap. xv. Sect. x1. is partly on Mysticism; for the Antinomians, see Art. v11, Sect. 111.

<sup>1 1</sup> John iv. 18.

in Love."—Baxter mentions some Enthusiasts, who conceive "a certain height of holiness,"—"a state of finless perfection, attainable "in this life"." He speaks of Origen and Macarius amongst the ancients, and of "some later Papists," as having favoured the conception.—The Familists, before mentioned, seem to have gone deep into it".

VI. Antinomians have held, that Christ, having fulfilled the law for them, has taken away Sin:their name of Libertines P was from their using carnal liberty, I think, as well as from their doctrine having that tendency; and probably fomething of this fort has occasioned some of the ancients to be accused of holding all actions to be indifferent .-Baxter fays, it is "the known opinion of the Antinomians'," that "God feeth no fin in his people; the guilt falls on Chrift."-These he calls afterwards " Libertine Doctrines," as fynonymous to Antinomian .- In Dickinson's Letters, an Antinomian reasoner says, "If he (a Christian) be united to Christ, and interested in his righteousness, he is perfectly righteous; and if he be perfectly righteous, he cannot be finful."-Picart mentions " some Moravian Anabaptists, who " omitted

m Pamphlet on Perseverance, 3d opinion; p. 4. & 5.

n Art. vII. Sect. 111. & VII.

Baxter, Ib. conclusion,—Fuller's Church History, 9th Book, p. 113.—Mysticism was an object of attention to the Reformers: See Art. VII. Sect. III. referring to Art. xix. of 1552, and Reform. Legum de Hæresibus, cap. 3.

P Art. x. Sect. xx. and Art. x11. Sect. 1. and Art. x111. Sect. v.

q Lardner under Basilides, Sect. xiii. Trent, Session vi. Canon 19.

r On Perseverance, page 12.

Page 40. Page 350.

Quoted by Rutherforth, Charges, p. 55.—See alfo Art. VII. Sect. 111. and VII.

"omitted this part of the Lord's Prayer, Forgive us our trespasses," &c. because being regenerated, they esteemed themselves to be without fin."

The "Brethren and Sisters of the free Spirit, as described by Mosheim", seem to have the nature of both Mystics and Antinomians.

When we spoke of hardening, &c. we quoted some expressions about God being the Author of all thoughts.

vii. From History, we proceed, as usual, to

Explanation.

The title of 1552 is somewhat different from ours. "No man is without Sin but Christ alone." It turns our thoughts to the sinfulness of man, which seems the proper subject of the Article; and at the same time it shews us the ground of the question, whether Christ was not, in any way, sinful;

namely, his having the nature of man2.

viii. It seems proper to observe how much of our Article is taken out of Scripture. Christ "was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted," may be looked upon as taken from Heb. ii 17. and iv. 15, united.—"The Lamb without spot," is from 1 Pet. i. 19.—"Who, by the sacrifice of himself, once made," is from Heb. ix. 26. and other passages.—"Should take away the sins of the world," is from John ii. 29.—" and sin was not in him," is from 1 John iii. 5.—"baptized and born again in Christ," may be conceived as taken from John iii. 3, & 5. joined. "Offend in many things," is from James iii. 2.—and the rest from 1 John i. 8.

IX. It

<sup>\*</sup> Cent. 13. 2, 5, 9, 10, &c.

Y Art. x. Sect. xx.

rected with this.—See page 19, 20 of his Recantation, Ed. Sirmond.

ix. It might be doubted whether our Article does, in strictness, affirm that Christwas not peccable: it certainly affirms, that he did not sin; which seems to amount to much the same: if sin had been in his propensities, he would "seemingly" have committed it sometimes, as we do, so many are the openings to sin; but this we cannot thoroughly understand.

x. "All we the rest," implies the human nature of Christ: it is calling him one of the human species, though distinguishing him as alone free from sin.

x1. "Baptized and born again,"—means, having gone through external forms of admission into Christianity, and having the suitable disposition; so

that Baptism a shall have its proper effect.

x11. The only thing remaining, of explanation, is fettling the kind of sins here spoken of, which all Christians have in common. Dr. Overalbays, "Articulus xv. de quotidianis et communibus peccatis tractat, quæ omnibus regeneratis communia sunt; in quibus offendimus omnes, salvatamen gratia, nec ab ea recedentes."—The beginning of the sixteenth Article, about every deadly sin—willingly committed, does give countenance to this opinion; so does the text from St. John, as well as that from James, which Bishop Overal has quoted; we deceive ourselves "if we say, that we have no sin;" none whatever. In the original,

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes the outward ceremony, fometimes fome privilege is used to express admission into Christianity; which of these shall be preferred, depends on circumstances: here it seems best to use both expressions.

b Short account of the five Points according to the Church of England; in a Vol. with Fur prædestinatus.—Dr. Overal was a moderate man: Regius Professor at Cambridge, Dean of St. Paul's, Bishop of Litchfield; then of Norwich, in 1618, seemingly for one year only.—Not in Biographia Britannica.

James's expression is, wolla yae wtaiouen anantes. wraiw is to stumble, make trips, mistakes.—Yet people fin in degrees different without end; therefore we must not exclude more heinous fins from the meaning of the Article, though it will extend to those run into by the best of Christians, and may be chiefly meant of them.—I before faid, that, when Luther is charged with holding "that invincible ignorance is not excuseable," the charge seems to have relation to the present Article; and some expresfions in Jerom's Dialogue with a Pelagian , feem to shew, that when the orthodox fathers spoke of all Christians as finful, they meant, that the best Christians fall short of perfect, or consummate virtue, in some thing or other.

XIII. We come now to our Proof.—There feem to be only two propositions remaining to be

proved.

1. Christ was void of fin.

2. No Christian is wholly void of fin.

Other propositions are certainly contained in the Article; but they have either been proved before, or are themselves brought from Scripture as proofs.

Christ was void of sin.

This has been, incidentally, proved before. It is also proved in this Article, as has already appeared, under the Explanation.—I may add a text or two. -If. liii. 3-5.-Luke i. 35.-John xiv. 30.-Acts iii. 14.—2 Cor. v. 21.—Heb. vii. 26.—In the Article, we have a proof of the Purity of Christ from the type of him, the spotless Lamb: from

c Sect. 111.

d This dialogue is transferred into the Appendix of the 10th Vol. of Augustin's works, p. 55. "Ego sentio, (says the orthodox character Atticus) nullam creaturam, secundum veram consummatamque justitiam, (δικαιοσυνη) posse esse perfectam." Append. to Art x1. Sect. xx.

his being a facrifice for the fins of others, which feems to imply, that he himself did not want a redeemer. The difficulty of his being perfectly pure arises from his being real man; but he was not conceived and born g in fin; he was conceived by the Holy Ghost; and, by that wonderful expedient, he became free from what we call original fin; how far that contributed towards his being free from actual fin, we know not. Yet if, ash before observed, he was peccable, he was very likely to have fallen into fin.

## No man is void of fin.

Texts to this purpose have appeared under the ninth Article: but the proposition is sufficiently proved in the Article itself. It may not be amiss to add, I Tim. i. 15. with regard to St. Paul, and Luke v. 8.—Gal. ii. 11. with regard to St. Peter: if we look round for other authorities, we must take care not to infringe upon other Articles; not even on the fixteenth: -What has been already faid, in describing Christian good works, about their imperfections', applies here directly.

xvi. Other texts will appear in objections; to

which therefore we may now proceed.

Against the perfect purity of the character of Chrift, might it not be objected, that, when a person calls him "Good Master," he disclaims the title of good, and fays, "why callest thou " me good? there is none good but one, that is God." This feems intended by Christ to rebuke the man for flattery; how good soever we see Christ to have been, when we review his whole life; the perfon rebuked could not fo clearly fee him to be good.

Of Leporius, see Sect. 111. & VII.

h Sect. IX.

F Pfalm li. 5.

Art. x11. Sect. v1.—See also Homily on the Misery of Man, 2d part, page 12, 8vo.

<sup>\*</sup> Matt. xix. 17.

good. But the reply might convey, and be intended to convey, a different idea to those, who knew the whole history of Christ: it might mean, I if I am good, strictly speaking, and at the same time a real man; it is owing to the union of the divine with the human nature, in my person.'—Our Saviour probably meant, moreover, in rebuking the person who called him good, to rebuke the general practice amongst the Jews of giving

flattering titles to the Rabbis'.

xv11. With regard to the universal finfulness of man, it has been objected, that certain persons are spoken of in Scripture as blameless. It seems fufficient to reply, that, whatever inculpatus means in any Latin, or αμεμπτος in any Greek claffic, " blameless" should be understood to mean in Enlish; that is, I take it, a person not to be complained of; one whom you would not think of blaming, but rather of commending. It is common to fay, this is a man of an irreproachable character;'- 'a most unexceptionable man.' We have before " explained good works, on principles of fact and probability, on which all language is built.-What Jerom fays o may amount to much the fame; some persons are called blameless, " non quod omni vitio careant, sed ex majori parte virtutum;" which gives the character.

It might not be improper to look back to the first objection under the twelfth Article, Sect. xx111. xv111. Let us now take, as an objection, the Pelagian dilemma. "Aut possibilia Deus mandata dedit,

Macknight, on the place, may be worth reading.

Macknight, on the place, may be worth reading.

Art. x11. Sect. v1.

P Jerom's Dialogue, between Atticus and Cretobolus:-

Append. as above, page 56.

I happen to take this from Augustin's works, Vol. x. page 51.—Appendix (the Epistle to Ctesiphon).— Augustin's answer to this objection may be seen in the Corpus or Syntagma Confessionum, page 116, (first paging) Col. 2.

dedit, aut impossibilia. Si possibilia, in nostra est potestate ea facere si volumns: si impossibilia, non in hoc rei sumus, si non facimus quod implere non possumus."—My answer would be, each command of God is possible to be performed, but (especially confidering our depraved propenfities, and our flanding in need of divine affittance,) the commands of God are so numerous, and each of them admits of fo many degrees of nicety in the principles, and of exertion, in the manner of performance, that it is extremely improbable, that, when we come to look back upon our conduct, we shall not perceive fomething wrong, in some respect or other; fo improbable is this, that, in common language, it is called impossible; there is no expectation in the mind, that it will happen: and in this fense our Lord himself says, "It is impossible but that offences q will come."-We have it in our power, however, to do what is fufficient for our Salvation'; that is, in every thing, to aim at doing well;—the impossibility here spoken of does not appear at all whilft we are resolving upon duty; not beforehand; the impossibility appears only on review; on calculation, or retrospect. Such impoffibility does not take away the universality of our principle of obedience; it does not put us on any footing different from those, who believe they can do their whole duty; it does not prevent our being confidered, and punished, as guilty for every command, which we neglect, or violate. fees all the variety of degrees, in which men endeayour to perform perfect obedience; and he can

I Luke xvii. 1.—See Art. x11. Sect. 1x. and passages there mentioned.

This answers Seff. vi. Canon 25, of the Acts of the Council of Trent.

reward or punish according to circumstances, be

they ever so complicated.

We should now take notice of an objection on the part of the mystic, and of one on the part of the Antinomian.

xix. The mystic may urge, I John iii. o. -"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit fin;"-which he might strengthen by I John iv. 17, 18; about perfect Love of God casting out fear:—my answer would be, this is a description of the Christian character, but not of any Christian: it is theory, not fact; it is what Christians must continually exert themselves to attain, but what no Christian has attained. - And the same distinction is applicable to other passages of Scripture: when we find ourselves exhorted to be perfect, &c. (though the word may fometimes be used for becoming Christians, compare Phil. iii. 12, and iii. 15.), we must consider the exhortation as comparative, and as pointing to ideal perfection; when we read descriptions of the faultiness of man, we must understand them as descriptions of fact. It also occurs in common life: Sir Joshua Reynolds has written much about ideal perfection, but he never confounds it with actual attainments. There is no one fault, which a Painter must voluntarily give into; yet there is no painter, who will not find, on looking back, that he has run into faults: and how abfurd would any man be thought, who faid, that he was a regular professed painter, and therefore could not paint wrongly.—The Scripture does not make a good conscience to depend on finless perfection, but on being "in all things willing to live honeftly"."-And, in ordinary life, a man is called a good Christian, notwithstanding his being obliged to cover', with Charity, "the multitude of fins.

xx. What

s Heb. xiii. 18.

<sup>1</sup> Pet. iv. 8.

mystic, may apply to the Antinomian.—Perhaps he might add such texts as Rom. viii. 1, 2.—Rom. viii. 33.—1 Cor. i. 30.—or Eph. v. 27.—Of the first some account was given under the ninth Article", which declares that text to be not inconsistent with concupiscence, though concupiscence has the nature of sin. The rest seem to belong to the Church of Christ as a collective Body, and the last,

to that body in a state of ideal perfection.

Rom. viii. 33, &c. feems to correspond to the mention of some form of Government, or political Constitution; or some Colony, or scheme for promoting the welfare of some large body of men. -Both Jews and Gentiles are admitted into Chriftianity; what a glorious fituation! people fo fituated can come to no real harm: who shall accuse them? that God who justifies them? Christ who laid down his life for them?—how idle must be the fears of people so protected! what are temporary persecutions to them? - all powers, of any real importance, are on their fide!—this, at least, is the fituation, which providence deigns to allot them: they may perversely neglect its advantages, or abuse them; be that upon their own heads.'-This is all expressed, or implied, in the passage; what a pity that folly should make anything out of fuch noble reasoning inconsistent with rational Religion and Virtue!

xxI. In this last place, this question may be proposed; if all men are sinful, shall none be happy hereafter? "the wages of Sin is Death."

-Nothing

y See Locke on Rom. viii 33, &c.

2 Rom. vi. 23.

<sup>&</sup>quot; Art. 1x. Sect. xxx11. \* Art. 1x. Sect. xxx & xxx11.

<sup>2</sup> Acts of the Council of Trent, Canon 25, of Sess. 6.

—Nothing has been proved here, which is inconfistent with the declaration of the twelfth Article,
that Christian works, though imperfect in themfelves, shall be accepted in Christ. God, on account of his Son, may reward men with happiness
inestimable, if they have been habitually "willing in all things to live honestly;" though he
may see in them some failings and infirmities.—
If any difficulty remained after this, it might
be lessened by what was said under the thirteenth Article, about Christian virtues having the
Nature of Sin.

Article, and farther illustrated the meaning of it by answering a few objections, I come to the Application.

As to Forms of Assent; we might, in natural religion, declare, that there is a character of ideal perfection, to which no one has ever in fact attained; and to which it is very unlikely, that any one ever will attain; so unlikely, that men, who speak from their feelings, would speak of such attainments as impossible. A Christian might express the sense of our Article, thus:

'Christ was a real man, yet free from Sin: the feeming inconsistency is removed by attending to his supernatural conception; and his purity is proved not only by words of Scripture, but by the types which presigured him, and by his being a victim for the sins of other men.'

· Other

b Art. XIII. Sect. XVII.

one is apt to think Horace's candour about poetry natural, and to hope for the same about actions.

Verùm ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit, Aut humana parùm cavit natura,

AR. POET. 351.

'Other men, though become Christians, may be considered as, in some degree or other, sinful: nay it is to be expected, that they always will be so. Not but the ideal character of the Christian is pure; and no man must allow himself in any sin whatever; yet such are our propensities, such the number of openings to sin; that, amongst the best, the fact answers, and is likely to answer, to the general declaration of Scripture; that all Believers frequently sumble in their Christian course; and that it would be hypocrify, or self-deceit, for any one to say, that he has no sin whatsoever.'

much difficulty between orthodox and Pelagians, as they feem to differ very little. Pelagians own, that no man is free from fin; Orthodox only fay, they cannot be, as speaking the result of experience.

—Orthodox say, that Christians may have only venial sins; Pelagians say, venial sins are no sins at all.—This will apply to more modern Pelagians,

Romanists, Anabaptists.

As to Mystics and Antinomians, I fear we must not attempt any rational compromise with them: they come under the observations, made under the seventh Article, about illiterate sects. What Baxter says, may be applied to them; "they are obscure teachers,"—" that shun the clear disclosure of their minds:"—Dr. Balguy's expressions seem also applicable to them; "Unfortunately the parties concerned are most of them out

d Cretobolus fays, "non dico hominem esse sine peccato, quod tibi forsitan impossibile videatur, sed posse esse si velit; aliud est enim esse, aliud posse; esse quærit exemplum—(so that he never pretended to know an instance), posse ostendit imperii veritatem.
—Page 56. Append. Op. Aug. tom. 10.

Nicholls on the Article.

Nicholls on the Article.

On Perseverance, p. 4.

Art. v11. Sect. 111.

Page 106. Disc. 6.

VOL. 111. E E

of the reach of rational conviction. They who appeal to their senses, instead of their understandings, are only to be pitied, not consuted."—Yet the notions of such must be examined, for the sake of those, whom they disturb and perplex.

Perhaps more attention to the difference between the ideal Christian, and the real one, might have

its use '.

i Something might be here urged about the confistency of Christ's conception in "the virgin's womb," with his character; and about the improbability of Fishermen forming such a plan, or drawing such a character.



## ARTICLE XVI.

## OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

NOT every deadly fin willingly committed after Baptism, is a fin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives: and therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

1. Although this Article treats only of the conduct of Christians, when they fall into sins of some moment, yet this subject has been seen in such different lights, that one single series of historical facts will not be sufficient. I will however endeavour to make two answer our purpose; at least as principal:—the first, relating to those who do not allow the efficacy of repentance; the second, to those who reckon that true Believers are made to persevere immoveably in their state of Grace, or Justification, by the affistance of God, in consequence of the divine promise. Some have used the word Implacabiles for the former, and to that has been opposed the word Impeccabiles; whether for those

who hold the notion, as well as for those who are supposed never to sin, may perhaps seem doubtful.

I begin, as the Article does, with those who deny the efficacy of Repentance; that is, when the fins committed have been heinous. In most, or all ages, men of fevere tempers have inclined to this.--Clemens Romanus b indeed speaks as a moderate man amongst us would do now: Welchman has part of the paffage to which I would refer, and he has some others from very ancient Christians: - But Montanus was severe enough: -He lived in the fecond Century, about 170, and therefore perhaps I might have passed him over, had not the great Tertullian become, in old age, his disciple. In Tertullian's Book de Pudicitiâ<sup>4</sup>, there are some very severe expressions; mæchia he calls immundabile vitium; he compares men who fin, to some discoloured stones (as I understand him) in an house infected with the Pestilence, which must be taken out and thrown intirely away: —he calls the repentance of a Christian a fecond repentance, the first having been before Baptism, and fays, that a fecond repentance cannot be valid. -And the Montanists in general "did not allow the Church the power to forgive great fins after Baptisim."

Novatus, or Novatianus, (I follow Lardner in giving these two names to one person) is placed in the year 251: He was a Presbyter of Rome. He formed the Sect of *Novatians*, "nolens (says Jerom)

Apostatas

2 Forbes xii. 9. 10. Instruct.

d See cap. 20.—Grotius (on Matt. xii. 13.) has fome good passages from Tertullian, &c.

e Lardner's Heretics, Montanists, Sect. 8.—Works, Vol. ix. page 489.—See also Vol. 2. page 376.

b Ep. ad Cor. Sect. 7. & 8, -Wake's Translation. c According to what was faid, Art. xv. Sect. 11.

Apostatas suscipere pænitentes."—He did not allow those, who had facrificed during the persecution, to be received again into the communion of the Church; but he did not deny that God might forgive them, though he thought the Church had no right to do fo .- His feverity, however, was not confined to this particular offence; the Novatians did not allow the Church to pardon mortal fins, or fuch as were particularly heinous, committed after Baptism. Some ancient f authors use the expresfion mortale peccatum, fome majora or graviora cri-The Novatians were, on account of their ftrictness, called Kalagos, and Mundi, which Lardner translates, Puritans.—Lord Kingh mentions, from Augustin, three kinds of repentance, the first, before Baptism; the second, what was called daily repentance, which accompanied the daily confeffion of fins in prayer; and the third, repentance for more heinous fins, fuch as were fometimes called mortal; the instances are murder, facrilege, &c.—The Novatians allowed the two first forts of repentance, but not the last.

Severity has probably varied, and appeared in different ways. Lucifer Bishop of Cagliari (capital of Sardinia) thought, that, when Priests apostatized, and repented, they might be re-admitted into the Church, but only as Laymen.

To

f See Lardner's Works, Vol. 3. page 216, &c.—See also a short expression or two, Appendix to Op. August. Ed. Benedict. Tom. 10. page 74, 75.

pression, "numquid persectè de poenitentia tractatum est, antequam obsisterent Novatiani? Art. 1. Sect. 1v. – Pacian, A. D. 370, wrote against the Novatians, three Epistles, extant, in Bibl. Patrum; and separate.

b On the Creed, page 382.

To this feverity is ascribed the very late Baptism of the Emperor Constantine, and others'.

In what manner the Fathers of the fifth Century declared against the Novatian rigour, may be seen in Lord King's History of the Apostles Creed;

under "Forgiveness of Sins."

111. But for understanding our Article, I do not think that we need look out for variations; we may content ourselves with those objects, which the compilers had chiefly in view; and thefe, I think, were the Anabaptists.—Both the confession of Augsburghk and our Homilies do refer to Novatians expressly; but their aim was, probably, to strike the Anabaptists a stronger and safer blow, by introducing the ancient Heretics 1. Sleidan, in his History of the Reformation, relates, that Philip Lantgrave of Hesse, in 1535, reckons up, to the Anabaptists, near or at Munster, their doctrines; amongst others, "their denying absolution to a finner that relapseth." And both our Reformatio Legum<sup>m</sup>, and our Homily n on Repentance imply, that fome perfons were troublesome in renewing Novatian doctrines at the time when they were composed. These might be called Novatians, as some were opprobriously called Pelagians °.

The Council of Trent seems not to have decreed much about Repentance after Baptism, of which

we

k Syntagma, page 55. Art. 11th.—Heylin Quinq. page 519.

-Homily on Repentance, page 418. 8vo.

i Lardner's Works, Vol. 4. p. 159.—The Donatists thought their sea so perfect, that quitting them was quitting Christianity; so they re-baptized: but of them more hereaster.

<sup>1</sup> Sort of Novatians, Strype's Whitgift, Book 1.—In 1562 the Convocation in England was fettled thus; "in the which also is to be determined the truth of those things, which in this age, are called into Controversy."—See Strype's Annals for that year; Chap. xxvii. p. 282.

m De Hæresibus, cap. 9. n Page 418, octavo. o Art. 1x. Sect. x11.

we need take particular notice at prefent. - It infifts on the necessity of the Sacrament of Penance; but that subject will occur under the twentyfifth Article.—Some of the Reformers had held. that only want of Faith could throw a man out of a state of Grace; that is, unmake him a Christian in the fight of God; one may fee what they meant; that, as Faith is that, by which a man embraces? Christianity, only the loss of that principle can render that embracing null and void: The Romanists opposed to this the doctrine, that every mortal Sin throws a man out of a state of Grace; meaning, probably, a state of Favour with God; that state, which the Holy Spirit particularly maintains and cherishes: so that a man under the guilt of a mortal fin, is not to be confidered, according to the Romanists, as a person in full possession of the fpiritual privileges of Christianity; he has something to recover. These two things are not directly opposed to each other; but they might found as if they were. It is an obvious effect of want of Faith, to run into the commission of heinous fins.

Of the Church of England I have been led to fay something, by speaking of the Anabaptists whom they opposed. And under the twelfth Article, I mentioned, that the Necessary Doctrine divides good works of Christians, into works of righteousness, and works of Penitents: and, under the eleventh Article, that it speaks of Justification as variable; as capable of being increased, diminished, lost for a time, restored.—In the Necessary Doctrine, several expressions occur to our purpose; but I will read only that part concerning Good workes, which is about acts of Penance when men

have

Art. x1. Sect. xv11.

f Art. x1. Sect. x1v.

have been in deadly sin; it begins, "Other workes there be," &c'.

Burn, in his Ecclefiaftical law, under Disserters, fays, "The tenets of the old Anabaptists were amongst other things,"—"that sinners after Baptism cannot be restored by Repentance," &c.—"all which were excepted out of the general pardons of 32 H. 8. c. 49. and the 3 & 4 Ed. 6. c. 24."

Puritans have had a notion of making discipline strict; and particularly, of excluding scandalous livers from the Communion. The Brownists, a species of Puritans, thought themselves the only true Church of Christ; a notion which, when carried to an extreme, is apt to make men unforgiving.

Fulke, who wrote upon the Rhemish Testament, was, I think, a Puritan: he says some severe things in answer to the Rhemists on Matt. xii. 31.— "That God will not forgive the sinne against the Holy Ghost, the text is more plaine, then that with any glosse of man's inventions, it can be obscured. That there is a sinne, which he that hath committed, cannot be renued by repentance, the Apostle speaketh as plainly,—Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6," &c.

IV. This might suffice for an History of the first set of men referred to in our Article, were it not for the mention of Sin against the Holy Ghost.—Some facts must be mentioned concerning mens notions of that sin. The foundation of all is in three passages of Scripture, which must be read:—Matt. xii. 31, 32.—Mark iii. 28.—Luke xii. 10.—Here is some sort of declaration of irremissibleness, and yet the sin not to be forgiven is not defined; and in other parts of scripture, men are said to resist and quench the Spirit, and to do despight to the Spirit of Grace. It is not very much to be wondered at, that men of grave and austere

<sup>5</sup> Necessary Doctrine is not paged.

tempers should, in the warmth of reprimanding and warning, come to speak of all heinous fins, as fins against the Holy Ghost; especially in those, who "are not under the Law, but under Grace." Origen, of old, is faid to have had this idea.— But it was more common to make any one Sin, or Herefy, particularly attacked in controversy, to be this undefined and irremissible sin. - Thus Athanafius makes a denial of the divinity of Christ, to be fin against the Holy Ghost. And the Rhemists, on Matt. xii. 24. fay, "The like blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is to attribute the Miracles done by Sainets, either dead or alive, to the Divel." -And on Matt. xii. 31. " which Sin he committeth, that dieth with contempt of the Sacrament of Pennance."

John Hales, at the close of his Tract upon this Sin, gives fix notions of it maintained by the Schoolmen, one of which is final Impenitency : another, impugning

t John Hales's tract on the subject, page 36. where the same is said of the Novatians: "they denied remission of sins to any that fell, thinking all falls of Christians to be sins against the Holy Ghost."—From Ref. Legum. cap. 9, it seems as if the Anabaptists of the times had held the same.

u See Fulke on the Rhemish Testament, Matt. xii. 31. where the Rhemists adopt the fix notions; and say as just now mentioned; and where Augustin seems to say, that, if a man set himself obstinately against John xx. 22, 23. refusing or despising that Remission, which was entrusted to the Apostles when they were told to receive the Holy Ghost, and died in such obstinate resusal, he might be said to sin against the Holy Ghost. But by what Augustin says about dying in the error, it is implied, that he thought a man might repent during his life time, and that with essect.— John Hales is mentioned in Mosheim's History; though I do not see his name in the Index to the quarto edition, which is the only one I have by me at present. I beg leave to apologize to my readers for sometimes referring to the quarto and sometimes to the octavo edition: it has been very irksome to me to change in such a manner; but it has been a matter of necessity:

impugning the known truth. Grotius is faid to have held, that it is the habitual disposition of an hardened finner. The opinion most commonly held, I think, is, that it is ascribing the miracles of Christ, or the extraordinary works done after his death, to evil Spirits. Archbishops Sharp and Secker have written on the fubject, and Macknight has fomething fensible in his explanation. Archbishop Sharp contends, with great appearance of reason, for the whole sentence being only a comparative declaration of the punishment due to Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, in comparison of other fins. But Lord King fays\*, the Fathers used, in repeating the Creed, to conceive " Forgiveness of Sins" to extend to all fins except that. -As I faid, before, there may be a wisdom in many of our Saviour's fayings, which we cannot yet fathom. That those, to whom he made his declaration, were guilty of the fin mentioned, may not be certain; much less can we fix it on any one else. - But our present business is History: let us now proceed to our fecond recital of facts.

v. Perseverance is a doctrine so seldom spoken of, that some may not know what it means. It is indeed properly subsequent to the doctrine of Election, and in most confessions comes after Predessination; but here it comes before, probably, that every thing about Sin after Baptism might come into one Article. We before mentioned it as the last of the five points. God is supposed to elect

certain

necessity: at some places and times, I could only get the use of the quarto; at others, only of the octavo.—The Apology is also wanted with regard to some other Books.

a Art. x. Sect. xv.

x Page 384. on Creed. y Art. xiv. Sect. v.

It is the last of the five points. - See Heylin's Historia Quinquarticularis. - Whitby on the five points: and others.

certain men, or predestine them to eternal happiness; during their passage through this life, they are exposed to many temptations and spiritual dangers; if they are not preserved from these, and made to persevere unto the end, their Election is all in vain. And there are several passages of Scripture, which seem to promise such protection; and which seem to engage, that God shall effect the

Perseverance of the Saints.

This is the doctrine, on which we are to make a few historical remarks.—The Stoics bused to hold, that a man once truly virtuous, was always virtuous. The Jews had high notions, that God would never forsake his elect; meaning themselves.—But the early Christians do not seem to have done more than hope for protection and Salvation. Vossius was a man of great learning, and hed says, that, before Augustin, the Latin Fathers (the Greek ones always) used to ascribe perseverance to the Grace of God, (it is but a series of good works), but not to any decree of God.

Augustin joined with his Predecessors in ascribing Perseverance to the Grace of God; but he added the idea of that perseverance having, in every case, been predetermined.—That all those, who are elected to go through a state of Justification to eternal happiness, will persevere in such state, seems only an identical proposition:—but some stubborn facts are apt to come in the way of this: good men do fall into sin; even those applauded in Scripture,

and

b Diogenes Laertius, in his account of Zeno, Segm. 127, 128. Edit. Wetstein.—The language is just like, Gratia amitti non potest.

c Art. x1. Sect. 1.

d Hist. Pel. Lib. 6. cap. 11, 12, Thesis.

This from Vossius, ibid. but Baxter doubts the authority; on Perseverance, page 8.—For Augustin's opinion see also Sect. xxx.

and inspired. How is this to be managed? why, says Augustin, others, besides the elect, may fall away; but they were never the elect, though upon f a soot-

ing with the justified.

This feems but trifling work, for to mere human eyes, according to this, fome true Christians, or Saints, persevere, some fail.—I really believe Augustin meant only to frame his notions so as to neglect no text of Scripture; he hit on no better method of bringing them into one plan, and so he adopted this method: perhaps some better may hereaster be found; but to neglect no text is the honest plan:—it is fashionable to think he went too far; many learned men have thought he did not go far enough. However wrongly he might judge, his mistakes, if such they be, were probably owing to his being serious, pious, modest, fearful of neglecting

f See de Correptione et Gratia. Cap. 13 .- T. 10. p. 510.

Sect. 40. Edit. Bened.

This seems the more probable the more one sees the manner in which he argues on different texts. He strongly disclaimed the notion that any individual could know whether he had the gift of Perseverance, or was one of the elect.—He says, God does not let men know this, for fear they should be too careless.—De Corr. et Gratia, cap. 13. (page 510. Ed. Ben. Tom. 10.)

De Dono Persev. Cap. 6. quoted in Sect. xxx.

In this way, could Augustin's Doctrine of Perseverance and Predestination do much harm? Is it not (as to Predestination) like that of our Church? (this again Art. xv11. Sect. v.)—After considerable attention I seem settled in my opinion, that Augustin meant only to keep both divine and human agency, which were to be reconciled as well as they could. He opposed the Yelagians in order to keep the divine agency, and the Manicheans, in order to keep the human agency. I do not think he could reconcile divine and human agency: and perhaps, in defending the one, he might sometimes, for a while, pay but little attention to the other.—And in defending either, he might understand some texts too literally. (See Art. x. Sect. x1.) That Letter to Valentinus, prefixed to De Gratia et libero Arbitrio, proves all this to me sufficiently.

h Baxter on Perseverance, page 5.
i Baxter ibid, page 6. quotation.

lecting any thing revealed: thus was he inclined to fupport, in general, the Divine Agency; and he probably felt, that what feemed peculiar to Christianity, was not to be softened in order to make way for vulgar notions and habitual prejudices of ordinary men. Then his adversaries might sharpen his temper in dispute; as he might often be fully persuaded, that they were wrong, when he was unable wholly to extricate from difficulties what he

judged to be right.

Such failures in the perseverance of Christians, as I have mentioned, have been the great fources of dispute. Some have been bold enough to fay, that, when Christians fall into Adulteryk, or drunkenness, or commit murder, they may perfevere all the while; not totally, but finally: Such offenders have been compared to leaves sprouting forth (for they are supposed to reform) from a trunk feemingly dead; or fire breaking out from ashes seemingly extinct. An auxiliary idea has sometimes been taken in, to folve fuch difficulties; fomething of a confirming, has been affigned as a cause of persevering; something subsequent to Justification; perhaps as supplementary to election; but I would not detain you with attempts at precision in this matter. Richard Baxter, who seems to have been a conscientious man, and well skilled in religious opinions, has stated twelve1 notions of Perseverance.

In his pamphlet, entitled, "Of the Saints Perseverance:" his honesty appears, page 16, 17. (the latter is noble,) and in his refusing the Bishopric of Hereford in order to adhere to his

old flock at Kidderminster.

Les Whitby's five points, end of first Chap. about Perseverance: and Baxter, page 12-Gurtler (cap. 15. Sect. 572. page 347.) says, "Docet reformata Ecclesia, illos nomination homines, quos Deus ex miserecordia potenter transsulti in statum Gratiæ, licèt quandoque a Peccato superentur et prostenantur, a Des tamen relevari et custodiri, ut manere in peccato, in quod inciderant, et interire in perpetuum, nequeant.

Perseverance, each held by some particular man, or set of men.—I will only, at present, observe, that as all was ascribed to Grace, there is a kind of Grace called confirming Grace;—the Gift of Perseverance.

Of *Special* Grace I have spoken under the tenth Article m.

v1. But to proceed with our Hiftory.

The Pelagians, I believe, ascribed perseverance in the Faith, to the agent himself; or thought it, some way, in his power to persevere.—But the Semi-pelagians are said to have made this distinction; they allowed, that Perseverance was so far owing to God, that men could not persevere without divine assistance; but they denied any one's having such assistance that he could not but persevere.

vii. It seems as if the idea of Perseverance as effected by God, may have been growing stronger from the time of Augustin, down through the Scholastic ages to the Reformation, and for some time afterwards.—Those of the Reformers, who were high Predestinarians, were high in their notions of Perseverance;—we shall see more of them in the next Article. Some thought Perseverance a consequence of Election, so that the truly faithful never do fall away; it is possible, they would say, but it never will happen;—others thought it impossible.—The latter, I think, were Zuinglians, the former, Calvinists.

viii. The Romanists reckon, that all Christians may fall into sin, and even continue in sin; and,

m Art. x. Sect. xix.

Porbes, Inftruct. Hiftor. Theol. 8. 19. 1.

O See the passage from Gurtler, "Reformata Ecclesia," &c. lately quoted; near the end of Sect. v.

P Baxter's 7th and 8th Opinions. —Calvin's own idea, Inft. 2. 3. 11.

well,

and, as before, that a mortal fin puts them out of a state of Grace: which state may be often lost, and recovered.—One might consult the end of Rom. viii. in Fulke's Rhemish Testament, though it rather runs into the doctrine of Assurance. However, what Fulke says in answer, is to our purpose; "We have no promise that we shall be preserved from all sin, but only from that which is irremissible; but that we shall always persevere in the favour of God."—Before we quit the Romanists, we may say, that almost all churches find some differences arise between their members, as to degrees of divine and human agency; this difference in the Romish Church we have mentioned under the tenth Article.

Arminians are commonly opposed to Calvinists.

They at first left our present subject in doubt; but afterwards declared, "that the Saints might fall from a state of Grace."—This is the opinion of the generality of Christians; particularly of the Lutherans, and, as most people think, of the

English Clergy.

I will be the less particular about the Reformed Churches, on account of the subject of the next Article: but some notice may be taken of the Church of England. The Necessary Doctrine says, "It is no doubt, but although we be ones justified we may fall therfro, by our own free wyl," &c.—this is in the part concerning Justificacion; and afterwards we are told, that we are to judge of our Election by our persevering: and in the part concerning Good Workes, it is said, that if, when Christians, we do not "apply our will to worke

<sup>9</sup> Sect. III.

r Council of Trent, Seff. 6. Canons 22, 23. and Cap. 15.

Mosheim, Cent. 17th, 2. 2, 3, 4. Vol. 5. page 345. 8vo.—Baxter's 2d Opinion.

well, we shall fall from the Grace of God," &c.—Bishop Overal observes, that our Article does not determine anything about total or final Perseverance, but that in our Homily "Of the declining from God," it is laid down, that wicked Christians, after Grace received, may perish finally.—I do not see such an expression; but there are several of like import. And near the end of the first part of the Homily on Good Works, it is said, that the Thief on the Cross was indeed justified by Faith; but if he had lived, and had not had both Faith and works, "he should have lost his Salvation again."

Salvation is here as like Justification, as any where

that I have feen .- (Art. XII. Sect. VIII.)

The Reformatio Legum declares, that they think perversely of Justification, who think, that

the once justified cannot fall into fin.

Mr. Baret's case is briefly and clearly related by Neal. A paragraph of his Recantation will shew, both what he thought, and what he was ordered to think. His affair occasioned the Lambeth Articles: they will occur in the next Article, but I will read the fifth now: in 1595, the Scholars of Cambridge were taught these. In 1603, at the Hampton-Court conference of conforming Clergy and Puritans, the Agent for the Puritans "requested, that to those words in the sixteenth Article, "we may depart from Grace," may be added, "but

Hift. Puritans, Vol. 1. 4to. page 387. A. D. 1595.

In a volume of Pamphlets, G-12-15, Camb. Library

The short History of the Lambeth Articles, (in F-15-8,
Cambr. bound with Fur Prædestinatus) seems to make the first difference at Cambridge, a difference between the Lectures of the two Professors there: Whitaker, Regius Professor, taught Calvinism, and Baro, Margaret's Professor, taught the opposite.

Baret did preach ad Clerum, &c. but he might be a follower of Baro: I am not, at this time, Master of the dates.

Lambeth Articles, in Overal, or Neal.

not totally nor finally:" which, as Dr. Waterland " rightly observes, "would have defeated the whole intent and meaning of the Article."-In 1618, the Synod of Dort has this Article, entitled, "Of the certainty of Perseverance." "That such as have once received that Grace by Faith, can never fall from it finally, or totally, notwithstanding the most enormous fins they can commit." When Oliver Cromwell was on his death-bed, he asked Dr. Goodwin, "Whether a man could fall from Grace? to which the Doctor answering in the negative, the Protector replied, then I am safe, for I am sure I was once in a state of Grace"."

Jonathan b Edwards held lately, and other able men hold now, this doctrine of Perseverance; though it does not feem to be dwelt upon in popular discourses.

1x. It feems doubtful whether we need feparate those who " fay, they can no more fin as long as they live here," from the advocates for perseverance. -fovinian is mentioned as the leader of a fect, " qui dicunt hominem post Baptismum nullo modo posse peccare;" but this was not on any predestinarian principle. How does Jerom argue with Jovinian on this point ?- The Mystics mentioned

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Supplement to Arian Subscription, page 53.

<sup>2</sup> Neal, A. D. 1658. Vol. 2. 4to page 512.

See on Justification, page 86, &c.
See Opera Aug. Ed. Bened. Tom. 10. Append. page 75.—
A confession of Faith thought to have come from some, who did not join in condemning Pelagius, &c. about the year 418.

d Jerom only proves the frailty and finfulness of man in general, feemingly: I fee no argument of Jovinian's but 1 John iii. 9. which Jerom only answers by 1 John v. end: he does not folve the inconfistency between a Christian's never sinning, and his being exhorted to keep himself from any fault, as Gentile worship, or idols. This error of Jovinian's is treated at the beginning of Jerom's fecond book against him. Bower's account of

VOL. III.

tioned by Baxter, were perseverers; and so were the Antinomians; we must read a word or two more about both these, than we did under the last Article: we faw, that they were (foi-difant) finlefs; but not that they were always to continue so :- our Reformatio Legum notices the Antinomians, in the chapter before referred to, in these words, " aut si forte quicquam eorum faciunt quæ Dei Legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatist non accipere." - The confession of Augsburgh condemns the old Anabaptifts as holding, that Christians after justification, cannot lose the Holy Spirit: and refers to others, "who think, that men h may have fo great a measure of perfection in this present life, that they cannot fall again into fin."-But the Anabaptists split into many opinions.

From all this we collect, that the Mystic, the Antinomian and the Predestinarian, hold the doctrine of Perseverance on different principles: The sirst, because he is united to God; the second, because his sins are all laid on Christ; and God sees no sin in his people: the third, because a decree passed in his savour, before the beginning of time.

x. It

Jovinian (Vol. 1. under Siricius) relates only facts; and has most reference to his Opinion, that Wives are as good Christians as Virgins are. By this Jovinian seems to have given offence: his idea about finless seems to have been, that, when a man was become a Christian, the Devil could not hurt him: could not tempt him; so as to seduce him; but see more Sect. xix.

<sup>c</sup> Baxter on Perseverance 3d and 9th Opinions: (Art. xv. Sect. v.) the 3d is about Enthusiasts: he mentions Weigelians, about whom see Mosheim, Cent. 16. 3. 2. 1. 12.

f De Hær. Cap. 9.

Syntagma, page 15. Alfo

h I think it ought to be, " fome men," the Latin is aliquibus. The English words are, I think, Heylin's.

x. It feems as if we ought not to close our History, without taking some notice of a Christian's affurance concerning his own falvation. Such perfuasion does not seem to have been entertained before the time of Augustin, except Jovinian had fomething of it; but Vossius hews, that, in the time of Augustin, several Fathers entertained it; though, from some passages, it seems as if Augustin himself had not!-Affurance of one's own being in a state of favour with God, and in a state which will continue, may arise either in the Mystic, or the Antinomian, or the Predestinarian way, as was just now said of the general doctrine of Perseverance.—As an illustration of the first, one might repeat the case of the Weigelians; of the second, Baxter's twelfth opinion; of the third, the notion of the Zuinglians m, or the Lambeth Articles, or Baret's Recantation, or the Article of the Synod of Dort; and we might add, the answer of Fulke" to the Rhemists, on the conclusion of Rom. viii. which would lead us to the opinion of the Romanifts, shewn in the Annotation on that passage: and that might be farther confirmed by the Canons of the Council of Trent.

The Church of England does not feem to fay much directly against Assurance; we see what is implied in this Article: (Sect. xxv.)-perhaps an expression

Baxter's 2d Opinion, with authorities, page 3.

k Hist. Peleg. Lib. 6. Thesis 13. page 750. where three degrees of Faith are mentioned; the third strengthens him so, that he can fall no farther; et hoc de se certissime sciat." This expression is from Gregory the Great,

See Baxter, page 7, bottom, from De Civ. Dei, Lib. 11.

Cap. 12. m Baxter's 8th Opinion; and fee Heylin's Hift, Quinqu. page 510.

Mentioned before, Sed. viii.

<sup>•</sup> Seffion 6. Can. 13. and 14.

expression in the Homily on Repentance may give the true sense of the Church. "Although we"— "fall into great sins," "yet," "by repentance" and "Faith," "there is an assured and infallible hope of pardon and remission," &c.

The conclusion of the Article of Faithe in the Necessary Doctrine, is also well worth reading.—It says, "but whether there be any special particular knowledge which man by faith (I neglect the spelling) hath certainly of himself," &c.—" cannot be found" (no such thing can be found) "either in

Scripture or Doctors," (Fathers).

I think Mr. William Law, a Mystic, used to teach the doctrine of Assurance; and so, if I mistake not, did John Wesley, on the same ground?: if Mr. Whitfield a taught it, which I should imagine he did, it might be upon Calvinistic principles. I fear some teachers have spoken ambiguously on this point; at least to them that are without: perhaps it might be only speaking of affurance as not absolutely necessary in all. I conclude with the honest confession of Richard Baxter; but the paragraph is too long to be transcribed: it ends thus; "I never knew the man that attained any more than fuch a strong persuasion, (as he had described) mixed with some doubtings and fears: yet so far overcoming them, as to live a peaceable joyful life."

I will close the History of this Article by obferving, that it is one of those, to which, in the time of Archbishop Wake, *Dupin*, made no objection. The account is given in Mosheim's his-

tory, Vol. vi. octavo, page 77.

xI. My historical remarks have run out into some length: but I hope I have introduced nothing which

P. S. See Dr. Rutherforth's 3d Charge.
P. S. See Rutherforth, ibid. opening.

On Perseverance, page 21.

which will be useless. I now proceed to Explanation.

We begin with the Title: " Of Sin after Baptism;" the title in 1552 was, "Of Sin against' the Holy Ghoft;" and then the Article said, in effect, the Anabaptists are wrong in calling all great sins, fins against the Holy Ghost; and therefore another Article was subjoined, which was entitled, "Blafphemy (not of Blasphemy) against the Holy Ghost." In this, the sin was defined, and declared unpardonable. I am glad it was blotted out; as I should rather doubt our authority, either to make the notion of the fin quite definite, or to declare it unpardonable, in an absolute sense. The title stands altered by the' hand of Archbishop Parker; and the reason of the alteration might be. that the subject of fin against the Holy Ghost was by no means the subject of the whole Article.

x11. "Not every"—this expression implies, that there may be some sin, which is properly sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable, though

"not every" great and wilful fin is fo.

Atticle, fuch as the best Christians are apt to fall into; there are several other words used, which are supposed to be equivalent to deadly; as great, heinous, scandalous, notorious, &c.—We have already had some Latin words to the same, effect. The word seems to have been taken from Scripture and

y Sect. 11.

s The title of the 9th Chap de Hæresibus in Resorm. Legum, is, "De casu (meaning the same as lapsu) justificatorum, et peccato in Spiritum-sanctum.

<sup>\*</sup> Strype, 1562, Annals.

\* Lord King, Creed, page 382.—Lardner, Novatus.—Works, Vol. 3. 216.

and the Fathers .- See 1 John v. 16 .- with which might be compared 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. and Gal. v. 21. though the word deadly does not there occur. Mortale peccatum we had before -- If any one asks whether I can always tell a venial fin from a deadly one, I answer, that divisions of things, and of actions, into classes, are useful, though it may be, in some cases, doubtful to what class a particular thing should belong. This is true of the genera and species of natural history; if you divide a set of animals into horses and affes, you will have a mule coming across to puzzle you, now and then; and the same fort of difficulty will occur in various instances, moral as well as natural. But the next expression should be taken in, before we proceed.

xiv. "Willingly committed"—in order to make a fin of the kind meant in the Article, it must not only be hurtful in its nature, but be committed wilfully. A man may perform an act which every one, hearing merely of the act, would pronounce mortal or heinous, and yet the man may not be upon the same footing with one, who commits the same act, knowing and feeling its heinousness: according to the Necessary Doctrine, if he does not perform it wilfully, "he loseth not the state of his Justification, but remaineth still the child of God?" What act more heinous than Parricide? yet the American destroys his aged parent; purposely indeed, but not wilfully, in the sense of our Article, or conscious of his crime.

xv. Now let us return to our distinction, between venial and mortal sins. We know by experience, in every way of life, in academical life, for instance,

<sup>\*</sup> Sect. 11.

I only modernized the spelling of this passage; it is in the part about good workes: rather after the middle.

instance, that there are some smaller irregularities, which do not throw a man out of the character of a regular man, though he may sometimes suffer some degree of punishment for them; but that there are others, more gross, which occasion a temporary suspension of his academical privileges, so that it is difficult to say, whether he is, for a time, a true Academic or not. Yet mere acts will not make the difference between irregularity which is tolerable, and that which is intolerable, except regard be had to circumstances also.

If no fins or offences are made venial, you drive men to despair; if particular offences are made venial, such come to be committed freely, and without remorfe; and almost any may, in some cases, be very pernicious.

You cannot, as the Stoics are faid to have done, make all offences equally heinous; that would drive a man to murder, when he might have aimed only at theft. Neither can any human reasoning convince us, that God will make all offences equal. Nay, the scriptures speak of some men having "the greater sin;" and of some who are beaten with few stripes, and others with many.

Attempts have been made to draw the line between venial and mortal fins: but neither the angelic Doctor Aquinas, nor the celebrated Cardinal Bellarmin, would fatisfy honest Richard Baxter<sup>d</sup>. Robert Baron gives five criteria; but they come too near fixing upon particular offences<sup>e</sup>.

—Our Church acknowledges the distinction, by praying, in her Liturgy, both against "every deadly fin," and for forgiveness of "Negligences and Ignorances."

Permit

b John xix 11. CLuke xii. 47.

d See on Perseverance, page 34.

Melancthon has written on this distinction.

Permit me to give my own idea of the manner, in which this distinction ought to be made. No fins whatever ought to be confidered as venial beforehand; but, when a man comes to look back upon his conduct, and finds, that he has run into fome things wrong, without having been very negligent, and without any deliberate bad purpose, then he may hope, that what he has committed will be deemed venial, if his repentance be proportioned to the offence into which he has run. But if he finds, that he has been extremely negligent, or that he has deliberately given up his good principles, in order to indulge some unlawful passion, then he should treat his offences as deadly; and by an hearty repentance, with fatisfaction to all whom he has injured, endeavour to restore himself to the divine favour. And, if we are obliged to judge others, we should put ourselves in each man's place, and proceed in the same manner; substituting for repentance, punishment. Such cases may have fo much fimilarity, as to occasion some general ideas of a difference between venial and mortal fins; but our judgment can never be right without great regard to particular circumstances. A polite French Abbé would reckon fins venial, which would shock a Puritan.

The distinction between sins of ignorance, infirmity, and wilfulness, is natural, as corresponding to that between the understanding, the passions, and the Will; but ignorance itself may be owing to wilfulness, or passions.

Sins of ignorance were thought by the Pelagians, no fins; but whatever is be corrected by punish-

ment,

P. 57. App. to 10th Vol. of Aug. from Jerom's 2d Dialogue.

Art. 1x. Sect. xxx.

Bishop Saunderson, in his sixth Sermon, ad Populum, on Gen. xx. 6. page 263, and Archbishop Sharp, on Heb. x. 26. Vol. 3. have something to this purpose.

ment, deserves punishment. Moralists have found it worth while to form rules for the punishment of Negligence. - And the Mosaic law has made the same provision. - Even the Gospel, though merciful to what is done through real ignorance, speaks of beating with few stripes the offender, who knew not his mafter's will.

xvi. "After Baptism"—better than after being born again, &c. because the mark of admission into Christianity, must, in the present case, be such as

all the Church could judge of.

XVII. " Is fin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable:"-We have here two predicates to the fame subject, and consequently, in strictness, two propositions.

Not every heinous fin is fin against the Holy

Ghoft.

Not every heinous fin is unpardonable.

Or our words might mean, Not every heinous fin is both fin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable; but the Reformatio Legum feems to condemn feparately those who hold, that every heinous fin is fin against the Holy Ghost; and those who hold, that every heinous fin is unpardonable.—On the whole, the true fense appears to me to be this; Not every heinous fin is fin against the Holy Ghost, in fuch sense as to come under the texts Matt. xii. 31, 32.-Mark iii. 28. and Luke xii. 10.; which, it has often been supposed, declare some sin to be unpardonable.

"Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism."-" the grant of repentance" is, in Latin, locus poenitentiæ; and in the English Article of 1552, "the place for penitents;" the Latin the same in both.

Locus.

Lev. iv. 2.—Numb. xv. 24, &c.—Deut. xix. 4.

Acts xvii. 30.

Luke xii. 47.

Locus panitentia is used in Heb. xii. 17. and in Clemens Romanus. - (See Parkhurst's Lexicon under peravoia,) and is by no means an unufual expression: but in our Articles, we may observe, that "the grant of repentance," must mean the same with "the place for penitents;" otherwise they could not both be English for the same Latin .-The meaning then feems to be, that heinous offenders may be permitted to have some place in the church; not the place of fuch as are at peace with discipline, and under no censure; but that of those, who have been in some way degraded, and are labouring to recover their former station. -And this agrees with the confession of Augsburgh", the members of which church (confessedly the most like ours of any) - damnant Novatianos, qui nolebant absolvere eos, qui lapfi post Baptismum, redibant ad poenitentiam. There must always be supposed, in every legitimate church, a connexion between absolution and remission of fins from heaven: See John xx. 23.-Absolution is then rightly given, when there is good reason for expecting such remission ".

TIX. "After we have received the Holy Ghost,"—this is another expression for Justification, or becoming Christians, as described from the internal part, or the act of God. It will occasion our using a little repetition: as one wrong notion may cause

m Eleventh Article, page 15. Syntagma.

n In the same 11th Art. of the Confession of Augsburgh, Re-

mission and Absolution are connected in this manner;

"De Pænitentia docent (Ecclesiæ apud nos) quod lapsis post
Baptismum contingere possit remissio peccatorum, &c.—Et quod
Ecclesia talibus, redeuntibus ad Pænitentiam, impertire absolutionem debeat."—I suppose that wavering between these two
things, remission and absolution, has unsettled the expressions of

o See Art. XIII. Sect. VII. & VIII. and places there referred to.

feveral errors. The corresponding chapter of the Reformatio Legum is intitled, De casu justificatorum. Why any particular expression was preserted, we may not always be able to see; but the title of our Article, as was lately mentioned, was originally "Of Sin against the Holy Ghost;" and the error of the Anabaptists was holding, that after men had been once justified, they could no more lose the Holy Ghost. The expression, as we have seen, is, "Damnant (Ecclesiæ apud nos) et Anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos, iterum posse amittere Spiritum sanstum." And Jovinian's notion was, that Baptism, (or the mysteries) impressed upon a man's mind good desires; so that, after Baptism, he could will only good; he was also restrained from error.

xx. " After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace given, and fall into Sin;"

This may be meant to be opposed to, after we are elected, or predestinated to happiness, we may fall into sin; which would be a contradiction: our Church then says, that the justified, or regenerated, may fall from Grace, and recover their state; but does not say a word about the fall of any persons supposed to be predestinated. Grace seems to mean the same with Holy Spirit; only the expression "depart from Grace," might be easier than, depart, fall, &c. 'from the Holy Spirit.'

XXI. " And

P Sect. 1x.—Confess. Aug. Art. xi. Syntagma, page 15.

q August. contra Julianum, pages 695. 891. Tom. 10. Edit.

Benedict. Jovinian, before, Sect. 1x.

<sup>‡</sup> See Waterland's Suppl. to Arian Subfer. page 53.—But elected may mean, either elected to eternal happiness, or only elected into the Christian Society, in the way to eternal happiness: in the latter sense, election, admission, and justification are synonymous.—The Necessary Doctrine (on Justification) says, "Whan we bee ones elected and admitted unto Goddis service, and have received our justificacion in baptisme or be restored thereunto by true penance," &c.

"Grace" may feem to be often repeated; but it would not have been reckoned right to fay, that a man could rife from the state of a mortal sinner to that of "a child of God," without ascribing such rife to the divine assistance: this is fully expressed at the close of the first part of our Homily on Re-

pentance.

"We may rise again," resurgere occurs in XXII. Vossius, and, most likely in the antients: it is opposed to lapsus, relapsus, casus, &c.-" let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." -Παραπιπτω fignifies, (Parkhurst) to fall away in Ezekiel, with reference to apostacy: waeaπτωμα means a fall, a trespass; Adam's transgression is called the Fall of Man, because denoted by wagaπτωμα. The Calvinifts would like better to have, "must rise again;" as that would express, according to their language, that the justified persevere finally: supposing the justified to be the same as the elect, (and the difference between them has been often neglected) this change would make this expreffion agree with our feventeenth Article, which declares, that the elect, meaning those predestined to life, will " at length" " attain to everlasting felicity." -Something turned upon this, when the House of Commons summoned to their bar, in 1625, Mr. Montague, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, then Canon of Windfor

But though our Article does not declare for the final perseverance of the Saints; it does not declare against it: "we may rise again and amend our lives." This is probably, what Bishop Overal meant

<sup>5</sup> Sect. xIV. from Necessary Doctrine.

<sup>1</sup> Cor. x. 12.

u See Collier's Eccles. Hist. Vol. 2. page 736. referred to by Waterland. Suppl. Arian Subs. page 54. or see Neal, Index. Mentagu.

meant (Sect. vIII.) by faying, Nihil hic de totali

aut finali defectione à Gratia explanatum est."

fipiscere: from re and sapesco, as it were; to recover one's sensex; one's right mind. The articles of 1552 and 1562 have here the same expression; they agree both in English and Latin.

which fay," condemned here means much the same as anathematized, which last is equivalent to " accursed" in the eighteenth Article: the Latin ex-

pression here is " damnandi funt."

xxv. "They can no more fin as long as they live here:" "they"—who? the persons who hold the doctrine, say not, in general, the justified, or the elect can no more sin; but they themselves in particular. Does not this look like a condemnation of the doctrine of assurance? I consider it as such. The change of persons in the Article, is not to be overlooked. The sirst part, about absolving the penitent, is all impersonal: in the next, we give our opinion of ourselves, we the orthodox, as Christians regularly initiated: in the last part, they whom we condemn, speak of themselves.

Latin; "veniæ locum denegant:" in the article of 1552, it is, again, "deny the place for penitents;" the Latin of which is, pænitentiæ locum denegant.—By the word again I refer to the eigh-

teenth Section.

XXVII. "To

Resipisco is used, in Suetonius, for recovering from a fainting-fit: resipiscentia was coined, from μετανοια, in the time of Lactantius, (Ainsworth); there is no idea of conduct in either resipisco or μετανοιω, except as far as reformation may be supposed to follow, of course, from recovering one's right mind, or reforming one's principles; — μεταμελομαι, to be uneasy, is only a step towards such change of mind; as has been observed at St. Mary's by Mr. Dixon of Benet College.

460 BOOK IV. ART. XVI. SECT. XXVII. XXVIII.

xxvII. "To fuch as truly repent."—The Latin, in both sets of Articles, is, "verè resipiscentibus;" but the English in the older set is, "to such as truly repent and amend their lives:" which may be compared with the middle of our Article, "and amend their lives."

If we compare the beginning of the Article with the end, we find a fort of inconfishency; in the beginning, not every fin is unpardonable; in the latter end, no fin is unpardonable. The latter notion seems the one intended, and agrees with our Homily, and with Lord King's account of the ancients. The former expression is evidently occasioned by the intervention of sin against the Holy Ghost. There is, however, no absolute contradiction between 'no sin is unpardonable,' and 'not every sin is unpardonable.'

Here then we close our Explanation, and pro-

ceed to our Proof.

xxvIII. From what has been faid, there feem to result four propositions; two principal, each of which has one subordinate.

1. No Christian is incapable of falling into heinous fins, or of losing the favour which he has with God as a Christian.

2. No Christian is taught in scripture, that he is

to be affured of his own Salvation.

3. No Christan, when he has fallen into any heinous sin, is incapable of recovery, if he sincerely repent.

4. Not every heinous fin comes under the texts of Scripture, which feem to condemn some fin against the Holy Ghost as unpardonable.

xxix. No

2 On the Creed, page 384.

r Homily of Repentance, latter end of first part.

xxix. No Christian is incapable of falling into heinous fins, or of losing the favour which he has with God as a Christian.

Of this, all texts may be considered as proofs, which, in any way, imply the possibility of such falling. As threatnings in case of such falling, promises on condition of persevering, exhortations

to persevere.

And the same may be said of all instances of such falling. The words of our Article seem to allow us to include the instances of David and Solomon, though they do not come properly under our proposition: but Peter does; and Hymenæus, Alexander, and Demas. All the Disciples of Christ too forsook him, and sled.—St. Paul had an idea of the possibility of his being a cast-away or reprobate.

And, as Perseverance is set forth as the work of the Spirit, all those texts must tend to overthrow it, which speak of the actions of the Holy Spirit as influenced by Man; which speak of man as able to resist, quench, or grieve the Spirit; or to do despite to the Spirit of Grace. These texts must also operate against the opinion, that the Holy

Spirit once gained can never be loft.

But I will mention some texts in particular.—
Matt. v. 13.—x. 22.—Luke xxi. 36.—Rom ii. 20,
&c.—1 Cor. viii. 9. 11.—xvi. 13.—2 Cor. vi. 1.
—Col. i. 23 —and ii. 5, 6, 7. (or 2 Thess. ii. 3.)—
The Epistle to the Hebrews has too many texts to be enumerated; its general design seems to be, to induce
Christians

David and Solomon, though under the old law, that they had received the Holy Spirit, and afterwards had fallen into fin.—Baxter calls David "a member of Christ," (on Perseverance, page 13.) and the Schoolmen seem to have had the same idea.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> I Tim. i. 20. <sup>6</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 10. 14. <sup>6</sup> Matt. xxvi. 56. <sup>6</sup> 1 Cor. ix 27.

Christians to persevere: we may mention, Heb. iii. 6. 14.—vi. 6.—x. 26. 38 .—1 Pet. v. 8, 9.—2 Pet. ii. 20, &c.—iii. 17.—Jude 20.

Whole Churches may be unchurched; compare Rev. i. 20. with ii. 5. These texts conclude against impeccability, on whatever principle it may be founded.

xxx. This may fuffice for direct proof, with regard to the matter of Perseverance:—Let us take some indirect proof, relative to the same subject, keeping as clear as possible of the subject of the next Article, Predestination; indeed, there seems little more wanting, on the doctrine of Perseverance, than to shew how understanding men might be induced to profess it: and this is best shewn by considering their objections to our arguments.

They feem to have thought this doctrine fuited to the Immutability of God: Baxter blames those. who of old held the Arminian opinion, "Yea, (he fays) when they faw that this was liable to be affaulted with the abfurd confequence of inferring a change in God, some did not slick upon git." -Heb. vi. 17, 18, would be added in confirma-But those, who keep in mind our manner h of acquiring ideas of the qualities of God, will allow, that we have no right to ascribe immutability to God any farther than it implies perfection, or is opposed to some imperfection. And it is not for man to consider it as any impersection in God to place man in a state of probation: nor to confider it as fickleness, to reward only during good behaviour.

f Whitby puts some of these texts together; on Perseverance, (as one of the five points) Chap. 2d. p. 414.

b Introd. to 2d Part, Sect. vIII. and Appendix to Art. xI. Sect. XIX.

behaviour. This is well expressed in the Necessary Dostrine, at the close of the presace, or Article of Faithe. And the immutable counsels of God, as described in the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, lead only to hope as their ultimate end.— It is called an anchor of the soul. We are told to be sober and hope unto the end. Hope always im-

plies a possibility of disappointment.

I will now give some of those texts, which seem the best supports of the doctrine of Perseverance; or impeccability.—Matt. xxiv. 24, may imply, that it is impossible to lead the elect into error: the prayers of Christ, Luke xxii. 32. and John xvii. 11, 15, imply, that God protects and preserves the faith of good Christians. John x. 28, declares, that Christians shall have eternal life, shall never perish, shall never be plucked out of the hand of Christ. Rom. viii. 38, 39, is to the same effect.—Rom. xi. 29, shews, that God does not give and take again. The tendency of other texts is evident: as 1 Cor. i. 8.—2 Cor. i. 22.—Gal. iv. 5.—Eph. i. 13.—iv. 30.—Phil. i. 6.—2 Thess. iii. 3.—2 Tim. ii. 19.—1 Pet. i. 5.—and 1 John iii. 9.

These texts may serve to give an idea of the manner, in which men have been induced to profess the doctrine of Perseverance. As we have mentioned them, it seems proper to endeavour to get some satisfaction amidst such contending authorities. And the more, as a due consideration of these texts will be the best introduction to the seventeenth Article, which has always been accounted particularly difficult. I will first take some notice of each of these texts, and then make a few

general observations.

Matt.

i Heb. vi. 19. k 1 Pet. i. 13. Vol. 111. Go

Matt. xxiv. 24. feems to me rather to imply a possibility of deceiving the elect, than an impossibility: I speak of natural impossibility, not of It implies, that false Christs would find much more difficulty in deceiving, by their specious pretences, those who were already grounded in the principles of genuine Christianity, than those who were not of any religion, which professed itself to be a completion of prophecies concerning the true Christ. Besides, the saying in question is itself grounded on an exhortation to beware of credulity. As to the Prayers of Christ, they must imply some degree of uncertainty; and are inconfistent with Perseverance being absolutely promised by God; or a gift quite determined upon. The prayer of Christ in favour of Peter, that his faith should not fail, was before it did fail; and though he rose again, and recovered his right mind, yet that was not the object of the prayer.

The prayer of Christ in John xvii, was for the whole body of Christians; there is no doubt, however, but that the whole body of Christians, as fuch, may depend upon having the protection of God; though that protection may not take any individual out of a state of probation. Nor, with regard to John x. 28, is there any doubt, that the flock of Christ is intended, as a flock, to have eternal life; though fome individuals may be found, "like sheep," to " have gone " astray." Our shepherd is strong enough, to prevent the wolf, or any plunderers, from plucking them out of his hand; but, if he depends upon them to "know his voice," and "follow him," some may wander and be loft. Of the conclusion of Rom. viii. we have faid fomething a lately. - Rom. xi. 29. relates intirely

<sup>=</sup> If. lin.6.

Sect. viii. and x. also Art. xv. Sect. xx.

intirely to the Jews', who rejected the Gospel: Such was the fidelity of God, that he would still perform the promise, which he had made to their "forefathers, Abraham and his feed for ever:" but this has no immediate relation to Christians; and, if it is applied to Christians, it is part of an argument which declares, that any persons whatever may be cut off from the Christian covenant, if they do not make a proper use of it. A gift not being refumed, does not mean, that the conditions of it are anulled. I Cor. i. 8. appears to express the general design of the Gospel. The Corinthians had enjoyed all privileges of a Chriftian church in time past; and might depend on the fidelity of God for the time to come: but this does not prove, that no conditions were to be performed on their part; only that those conditions need not be enumerated just in that place, not in the exordium of the Epiftle. The passage, on the whole, has the air of an eloquent and refined exhortation. - The next passage, and three others, mention the Holy Spirit, given to the converts, as a feal or a pledge. I apprehend, that, by the Holy Spirit, is meant, in these passages, the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. - A feal sometimes

· See Locke and Taylor on the place.

P How did this act upon the Heart? there might be firong moral fentiments excited by the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit: gratitude, benevolence, &c.—Devout affection also would naturally arise: the difficulty is rather to see how any man could have supernatural gifts without being virtuous and pious, both before and after they were entrusted to him, than how he could be so. It is indeed possible for a person to abuse supernatural gifts, as we find from Matt. vii. 23.—1 Cor. xiv. 9;—but it is a thing so exceedingly strange, that we may be fairly allowed to consider extraordinary gifts of the Spirit as generally implying a disposition previously good, and as nourishing every good principle.

times is a fign of a contract; fometimes a mark set upon anything in order that it may be known to belong to a certain proprietor. A pledge is either a fecurity, or an earnest, which means, a payment in part. Now, though the expressions of Scripture may have a mysterious and figurative sound, yet there is nothing in them, on which the doctrine of Perseverance can reasonably be founded. to a contract does not oblige one party fingly, but both reciprocally: fo that if one party neglects conditions, the other is released. A seal, as a mark, does not imply, that the thing marked cannot be alienated, or destroyed, if it does not answer its purpose. A pledge is only a contract of the accessory kind. An earnest engages to nothing more than to pay the remainder of what was engaged for; which is only to be paid if all conditions are fulfilled.

Gal. iv. 5. shews, that we are on the footing of adopted sons in the fight of God; but though adopted sons do, generally speaking, inherit fortunes, yet any one may be disinherited for ill conduct. As to Phil. i. 6. is merely a compliment devoutly expressed; it is evidently an essuance of Christian pastoral affection: nothing can be concluded from it in the way of speculation: the good behaviour of the Philippians was to be referred to God, and they were not to doubt of the continuance of his protection.

2 Thess. iii. 3. is of the same kind with some of the foregoing: it is clearly addressed to the whole church of Thessalonica, whatever difference of character might be found in the individuals.

And we might fay of 1 Pet. i. 5, that any one, who understands the foregoing, will not find much difficulty

<sup>9</sup> Grot. 2. 12. 6. de Jure, &c .- Balguy 2. 3. 1. 34. MS.

difficulty in that; but by looking back to the third verse, we see, that nothing beyond hope was in the mind of the sacred writer.

Of the last text, 1 John iii. 9. we have spoken before<sup>r</sup>.

Having now taken some notice of each text, we

may proceed to a few general observations.

1. The texts in favour of Perseverance are of a losty and mysterious nature; those against it are much more level to human affairs; we ought therefore to have a greater dissidence in interpreting the former than the latter; we ought to conclude, that the idea which we have of the former, cannot be an adequate idea; though that which we have of the latter, probably is adequate. Matt. xxiv. 24, for instance, is part of a Prophecy, which has been thought to have both a primary and a secondary sense.—I Cor. i. 8. and I Pet. i. 5. give some losty and faint intimations of the counsels of God, such as to us must be, in a very great degree, unintelligible.

2. The texts produced by our adversaries are eloquence, ours are practical directions. Now what is intended to move and persuade is never to be taken so literally as that which is to be the guide of our conduct. Making eloquence into systems of speculation, has been the grand cause of error and controversy amongst Christians; it is particularly, the way in which men of good understanding, great learning, and of a grave and pious turn, have been missed. It is observable, that several of the texts which are urged against us, are parts of exordiums: and Eph. iv. 30, though not an open-

Art. xv. Sect. xix.

Book 1. Chap. xv11. Sect. x.

t Introd. to fecond Part, Sections 1x. x1. x11. and Art. x. Sect. x111.

ing, is preceded by fine, affectionate, moral advice,

and is rifing towards the pathetic.

3. The texts of our adversaries have more relation to Theory, or what ought to be, ours more to fact, or what is.—This remark has been " made before.

- 4. The texts against us belong more to collective bodies, ours more to individuals; the effect of this has been already shewn: When our church was delivered from the dominion of the Pope, it certainly was not to be expected that each Protestant should have all the characteristics, which belong to the collective body of Protestants; and each Papist all the characteristics of Popery. Some private fubjects enjoy more liberty under a Monarch, than others in a free state. John x. 28.—Rom. viii. 38, &c. — and feveral other texts come under this remark.
- 5. When Perseverance is spoken of as the gift of God, what we have faid under the tenth Article should be applied; for Perseverance is only a series of good acts, or of acts favoured as good. As therefore we were never to refer any good act to the Grace of God, till it was pasty; so neither ought we to ascribe our Perseverance to God, till we have persevered. Whatever opinion may have been entertained of Augustin, this was as much his doctrine as it can be any one's.

6. Laftly,

<sup>&</sup>quot; Art. xv. Sect. xix.

<sup>\*</sup> Art. xv. Sect. xx. with references.

Y Art. x. Sections xxxv. xLII. L.

Dono Perseverantiæ, Cap. 6. Whence it appears, that Augustin faid, Perseverance could not be lost, merely because it is absurd to fay, that can be lost by any man, which you cannot know to have existed till the end of life arrives.—See Sirmond, Vol. 3. Opuscula, page 91. - Plaifere and Baxter (Persev.) have fomething to the purpose.

6. Lastly, interpreting Scripture more literally than other popular language, must always produce error. After all that has been said of Phil. i. 6, there seems no sufficient reason why it should be interpreted more literally than the proverbial expression; 'a good beginning makes a good ending:' and "if it were possible," in Matt. xxiv. 24, should be compared with Acts xx, 16. "he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost."

I now proceed to the fecond proposition, which is annexed to this, and, in a manner, comprehended under it.

xxx1. No Christian is taught in Scripture, that he is to be assured of his own Salvation.

This follows from what has been already proved. Under the fifteenth Article it appeared, that no Christian can say, at any moment, that he is fin-less: and under the sixteenth, that no Christian is incapable of falling into heinous sins: the consequence is obvious, if we only allow, that without "holiness" "no man shall see the Lord;" which we have endeavoured to prove more at large under the twelfth Article.

To produce additional texts is no way difficult. Luke xii. 4, 5.—Rom. xi. 20.—1 Cor. x. 12.—Phil. ii. 12.—Heb. iv. 1.—xii. 28.—1 Pet. i. 7.—these may suffice; nothing need be added in the way of direct proof. Let us look out for some indirect proof relative to the doctrine of assurance, taking the strongest proofs of our adversaries which we can find.

We must conceive one of them to urge Heb. vi. 11, and x. 22. I used to be told, that these texts were urged in making converts. Some also

<sup>2</sup> Heb. xii. 14. G G 4 have argued thus; Christ died for my sins, therefore I ought to assure myself he did not die in vain. Some have proved assurance from their own inward experiences: and, we may observe, as our direct proof has turned much upon fear, that some have said, Fear was not inconsistent, at least, with perseverance; on the contrary Fear caused perseverance. And it has been said, that some learned and sober-minded men, free from enthusiasm, have declared, in the most credible manner, when dying, that they selt more than even a lively hope of salvation.

In reply, we reason thus; the affurance mentioned in Heb. vi. 11. is only "the full affurance" of hope;" and it stands between two exhortations to diligence. Heb. x. 22. mentions the "full assurance of Faith," but the beginning of the next chapter informs us, that "Faith is the substance of things hoped for."-Christ died for me; true; so he did for the whole world; is the whole world affured of Salvation? that is not faid. As to inward feelings, the scope of Mr. f Locke is, to prove, that the enthusiast himself has not reason to conclude that he is inspired; but supposing he had, he certainly gives no proof to any one elses. Selfdeceit is always to be suspected; Jeremiahh says, "the heart is deceitful above all things:" Bp. Butler treats the subject of self-deceit in his masterly way: and what he fays of it in general, feems applicable to this

b See Rutherforth's 3d Charge, notes.

Baxter on Perseverance, page 39, bottom.

d The Catholic Doctrines, &c. page 37.

whom the Lambeth Articles were proposed by Professor Whitaker in 1595, substituted *Plerophoria* in the fixth, instead of certitudine; and they wished (or some of them) to have substituted spei for fidei.—F—15—8. Cambr.

f On Enthusiasm, Hum. Und. Book. iv. Chap. 19.

g See Baxter on Perseverance, page 20.

h Jer. xvii. 9.

this particular case. Either a man is conscious of having deceived himself, or not: if he is, he has deceived himself in some degree; if not, he has de-

ceived himself in a great degree 1.

Men persevere by means of Fear; it does seem possible, that God may foreknow, that a man may persevere unto the end; and fear may be the instrument by which he perseveres; but while a man fears, he can know nothing of the event; except as far as he forms an estimate of his condition from examining the state of his mind, and comparing it with the Laws of God; to such judgment as this we have no objection; but we would not call it certainty.

Lastly, I will not deny the fast, that some men have afforded reason to believe they enjoyed, on the point of death, something beyond a lively hope of suture bliss; supposing they really did, that is very different from its being taught in Scripture, as a doctrine, that every good Christian must have an assurance of his being in a state of Salvation, during a good part of his life. Good and sober men, with very sew exceptions, have disclaimed such doctrine; though as likely to experience the blessed influence of heaven upon their minds, as any men.

I imagine,

With regard to Baxter, see end of Sect. x. and his Pamphlet on Perseverance, page 20, 21, and 17; and the end of this

Section: For Augustin see Sections v. and x.

As all Christians must acknowledge the influence of the Holy Spirit, the precise meaning of expressions relating to it may sometimes be difficult to ascertain: but I have understood it to be declared, with regard to some thoughts or feelings, though not with regard to all, that a man, (not every man) may distinguish whether they arise in his mind naturally, or come from the Holy Ghost; may say, with regard to some sentiments arising in his mind, 'this is from the Holy Ghost.'—I mean, that I have so understood what I have heard myself; spoken in public; spoken with earnestness, and distinctness, though in the Latin language.

.I imagine, that the doctrine of affurance has fucceeded, as much as anything, from an idea, that those who disclaim it, refuse to the good and pious a lively spiritual satisfaction, or joy in the Holy Ghost: yet this is far from being the truth. -It feems possible, that they, who have for a length of time lived in confirmed habits of virtue and piety, may look forwards to a future life not only with comfort but with rapture and exultation; though perhaps never without some degree of diffidence, or modefty. If they have been in all things willing to live honestly, they may trust they have a good conscience: if their heart condemn " them not, they may have "confidence toward God:" they may tafte the good word of God, and "the powers n of the world to come, in such a manner, as to enjoy great happiness, without ever being out of a state of probation. I conclude, as before, (Sect. x.) with a fentence from Baxter, where he is shewing the necessity of religious fear, and at the same time shewing how it should be regulated. -" We teach all Christians to contend with the utmost diligence, to get up to the highest trust, love, joy, thanksgiving and praise, as the proper evangelical excellency nearest heaven: and to get as fast as they can, above that fear which hath torment, which is cast out as love groweth perfect: and to pray and feek for the Spirit of Adoption, of Power and love, and of a found mind, instead of the spirit of Fear and Bondage: and not to place too much of their religion in that very fear which in its feason is a duty; much less in hurtful, finful fear: but always, and in all things,

<sup>1</sup> Heb. xiii. 18.

m 1 John iii. 21.

<sup>Heb. vi. 5.
Catholic Theology, part 3, page 257.</sup> 

BOOK IV. ART. XVI. SECT. XXXII. XXXIII. 473

to rejoice in the Lord, with love and gratitude; and confidently to cast all their cares on him."

xxxII. Our third proposition is,

No Christian, when he has fallen into any heinous sin, is incapable of recovery, if he sincerely

repent.

This will seem, to most men, self-evident; but yet there are texts of Scripture, which have led some men into a contrary opinion. Examining the true meaning of these, will be our principal business. The direct proof need not be long; it will be given more for the sake of regularity, than because it is absolutely necessary.—Consult then Matt. vi. 14.—xviii. 24—32.—Luke xv. both as to the joy over a repenting sinner, and the Prodigal Son.—John xx. 23.—2 Cor. vii. 10.—Gal. vi. 1.—Eph. iv. 32.—2 Pet. iii. 9.—1 John i. 9.—Also the instances of forgiving David and Peter.—The expressions of the Pevangelical Prophet, on this head, are strong.

The chief objections feem to be eight in number; I will mention them all, before I endeavour to answer any of them. If the difficulty of some of them detains us, it will promote candour towards such of our Christian brethren, as may seem to have encouraged needless doubts about a plain

doctrine of Christianity.

xxxIII. I. Does it not appear from I John iii. 9. that whoever commits fin, degrades himself to the rank of the unregenerate?

2. Does not he, who commits one fin, according to James ii. 10. make himself guilty of all fins?

3. Though repentance before Baptism be available to the remission of sins committed before Baptism, yet will a second and a third, and an endless

endless feries of repentances, be available in like manner? Tertullian could not think so; and the Romanists think it so unlikely, that they make the falshood of such a notion the foundation of their Sacrament of Penance.

4. Does not I John v. 16. teach us, that it would be vain and presumptuous so much as to pray to God for remission of a deadly sin?

5. Are not we taught in the fixth chapter to the Hebrews, that it is impossible to renew to repentance,

fuch as fall away?

6. Does it not appear from the tenth chapter to the Hebrews, that those, who fin wilfully, have "no more facrifice for sin; but a certain fearful

looking for of judgment?"

7. If there be so much difficulty in the recovery of a sinner, when he is not supposed to have persisted in sin for any length of time, what must be the case, when he has acquired habits of sinning?

—" Can the Æthiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" then may he "also do good," who is "accustomed to do evil."

8. Nay, does not God fometimes give men over to a reprobate n mind? and do not they then go beyond a mere facility of finning? are they not then enflaved by appetite? do they not contract unnatural cravings, and feel themselves in bondage

to depraved propenfities?

These objections contain some of the most disficult parts of Scripture; but supposing they could not be satisfactorily answered, they would not overthrow the general doctrine of the Remission of Sins; they might leave an awful dissidence on the mind, as no part of scripture should be neglected; but yet their effect need only be, to occasion a suspense, till the texts on which they are built, were fairly reconciled with others more perspicuous and familiar.—This observation is the more applicable to these texts, as they appear to be introduced in an extraordinary manner, on occasions by no means common. But let us venture upon an artless examination of each of them.

1 Of 1 John iii. 9. an idea has been already given; and it has also been shewn, that regeneration allows of progressive and gradual improvement; of an approximation to the ideal character of him, who "doth not commit Sin." An heinous sin may throw a man back in this progression, but may not throw him entirely out of the path, so that he shall never be able to regain it.

James ii. 10. does not seem to mean, that a man who commits one sin, is overwhelmed and lost, in the same manner as he would be if he did nothing right; but only, that he may be said to violate the Body of Laws taken collectively; or to be "a transgressor" of the Law:" and therefore is not innocent, or blameless, however he may value himself upon his regularity in other points. A man, who broke one of the laws of the twelve tables, might be said to break the law of the twelve tables.

If you heard any one say, such a person is a friendly good fort of man, but we cannot prevail upon him to observe the College Statutes; you would never suspect him of violating all the Statutes, but only some one or two which stood most in his way. St. James seems to have had some regular, worthy persons, who, without meaning much harm, behaved rather insolently to the

Door

This plan of keeping both doctrines till they can be reconciled, see before; Art. x. Sections v1. x1. xLv1.

<sup>\*</sup> Art. xv. Sect. xix.

Art. 1x. Sections xxIV. and xxXII.

<sup>&</sup>quot; James ii. 11.

poor in religious affemblies, and shewed too great an attention to the rich; he tells them that, while they allow themselves in such conduct, they must not value themselves as if they were perfectly blame-less.—No one, in short, must ever be allowed to say, I will do my duty with one exception, or two exceptions; he must act upon a principle of being in all things willing to do his duty: the exceptions will shew themselves soon enough, without being made beforehand.

James ii. 10. then belongs to those, who are about to do their duty, and are settling their principles of action; whereas repentance implies retrospect, to which the saying of James seems inapplicable: except as far as it may direct a penitent to ask himself, whether he set out with purposely neglecting any duty.

3. Whilst the preachers of the Gospel were making Converts, remission of sins prior to Baptism, must be the common theme; but yet the Christian plan must be, to give remission of sins, at all times, more easily than it could be procured on any other plan.

The prophets must foretell the Christian Dispensation with a view to the perpetual continuance of it: see Is. liii. 5.—Jer. xxxi. 34.—and Matt. xxvi. 28, and Acts v. 31, must have the same extensive meaning; so must all that is announced by John the Baptist. Indeed to "give" repentance,"

John the Baptist. Indeed to "give repentance," must be nugatory, if it is only for sins before baptism; and so must be the institution of the Lord's supper, considered as a "continual remembrance of the death of Christ." Consult, moreover, Acts xx. 28.—Heb. iv. 15.—1 John i. 1, 2. and our proofs of the doctrine of Atonement:

Append. to Art. x1. Sect. xx11.

<sup>\*</sup> Δέναι μετανοιαν fee Parkhurst's Lexicon, under μετανοια.

also our direct proof of the proposition now before us. If a Christian does frequently relapse, he may find it more and more difficult to recover; and he may be punishable in a greater degree; and the discipline of the church may proceed accordingly. Yet in no case is an hearty repentance, suitable to the occasion, to be deemed wholly ineffectual.

Even excommunication is only like ruftication; it allows of the offender being reconciled to the Church. All we here prove is, that fallen Chriftians may rife again; how far a Sacrament of Penance may be needful for that purpose, when we have the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, must be considered hereafter.

4. The text 1 John v. 16. is not easy; some have thought it related to curing difeafes by the prayer of Faith, like James v. 14, 15.—If fo, it is clear of our present subject. But, supposing it to relate to fins, the whole paffage may have this meaning: "Intercessions may be properly "made for all men ";" for lighter offences they may be made with effect; but when that is declared, it must not be understood to be expressly declared, at the same time, that intercessions shall prevail in favour of all heinous fins. If your brother commit an heinous fin, it is not forbidden you to intercede for him: the case stands in b need of Intercession clearly; but that was not the thing meant. No one can engage, that intercession shall procure forgiveness for all fins: a relapse into Idolatry must be attended

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See continuation of Benson: by imitators of Mr. Locke's exposition.

I Tim. ii. r.

My brother, Samuel Hey, is of opinion, that the words "I do not fay that he shall pray for it," may mean, "I need not fay;' 'it is evident à fortiori:' he adds, that he has compared other passages, like, 'I fay not.'

ε Ου τεςι ΕΚΕΙΝΗΣ λεγω ίνα εξωτηση.

offences, it must not be thought a matter of course, that prayer is to preclude a future judgment.

Deadly fin therefore may be prayed for; though

not perhaps effectually, if it be not repented of.

5. In Heb vi. the meaning of the whole paffage must be attended to. The Apostle presses the better fort of Converts to make a gradual improvement; if they did not do that, they were in great danger of going back, farther and farther, till they relapsed into Judaism: this was to be prevented if possible. He urges strenuously, ' If, instead of improving, you go back, what must be the confequence? what can possibly be expected ? cannot fuch a foretafte as you have had, of heavenly good, keep you in your improved state?—The whole process must then begin again! yet nothing can be tried, in your case, which has not already failed: how much less likely is it to succeed a second time! Christ died, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and became Head of the Church: all this you have felt the force of, and have applied to yourselves. If you undo this, what is it, in effect, but calling Christ an impostor, and consenting to his ignominious death! how difgraceful! to Him and to You! A Field has been watered by a genial rain; if its fertility appears in Corn, well; the bleffing of Providence is upon it, and it makes the heart of him rejoice that tilled it;but, if only "thorns and briers" spring up, what a mortification! has he who tilled it, or ordered it to be tilled, any hopes?—any remedy? will he not be apt to exclaim,—'twere best to burn it up at once?

Such

e Apollos, 1 Cor. iii. 6.

For impossible, in the sense of 'not to be expected,' see Art. x11. Sect. 1x. and Art. xv. Sect. 111. with references.

Such seems to be the meaning of the argument; but it cannot be fairly applied to different circumstances. Before the converts relapsed, it was a fair argument to press; afterwards, the Apostle would have exhorted them to repentance. Repentance would become more difficult by a relapse;

but not ineffectual.

6. Heb. x. 26. will feem clearly to be about wilful Apostacy, to any one, who reads the 23d and 28th verses, (with Deut. xvii. 2-6,) and also the 32d and 38th. Indeed all the 11th and 12th chapters would confirm the notion. The symptoms of apostacy are first mentioned, in the 23d, 24th, and 25th verses; and then the fin itself, with its The Apostle's address to the conconsequences. verted Hebrews, in this alarming fituation, feems to have been to this effect. 'Supposing the Christian religion true, and Christ really the Son of God, it cannot but be an heinous thing to defert Christianity. How can any one do it without treating the character of Christ in a contumelious and contemptuous manner? And how could God fend his Son into the world, and permit him to fuffer, and to die, if it were a flight and indifferent matter to forfake his religion? Perhaps you may build your hopes on the facrifices, to which you have been accustomed; to their returning periodically; but they are at an end! "Now once, in the end of the world," hath Christ sacrificed himself; but what facrifice can be available for Apostacy? not the Jewish, as being superseded; not the Christian for that is despised.' Thus might an Apostle argue, in order to prevent converts from making their Baptism void; but such argument cannot invalidate

f Art. x1. Sect. x1. with references. 8 Heb. ix. 26. Vol. III. H H

invalidate repentance whilst Baptism continues in force.

7. Habits do certainly add difficulty to repentance, but do not destroy its efficacy. Indeed if they entirely incapacitated men for repentance, there would be a case, in which a man could not recover his lost spiritual condition; but, in strictness, our proposition supposes repentance possible; and only affirms its being available. And in sact, every man may repent if he will; every bad moral habit is to be unraveled, or dissolved, as it were, in time, and a good one formed in its place; though, in some cases, it is not to be expected, on a sooting of probability, that this will happen; at least, in any short time.

8. The language about a reprobate mind, is only a referring of bad habits to the superintendence of the Governor of the world: It can therefore add nothing to the last mentioned difficulty: and it has been treated before.

I might have mentioned the case of Esau, who "found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears;" but the peravoia mentioned in that case does not seem to have been a change of mind in Esau himself, but in his Father Isaack, whom he intreated for a blessing, in vain. Parkhurst's Lexicon may be consulted on this point, under peravoia.

every heinous fin comes under those texts of Scripture, which seem to condemn some sin against the Holy Ghost as unpardonable.

I need not dwell long on this; after what has been faid about heinous fins being pardonable; especially as the notion, that all heinous fins are of the same class

h Art. x. Sect. L. i Art. x. Sect. L.

k Gen. xxvii. 38.—Heb. xii. 17.

class with the sin mentioned Matt. xii. 31. has not been held by any considerable number of respectable Christians. The three passages about this sin do, in reality, only make one; and the singularity of the denunciation makes it very improbable, that it should be applicable to all heinous sins.—Supposing all heinous sins were of this sort, what a great alteration must be made in scripture, before that was fully expressed!—The Epistles contain nothing about blasphemy, or sin, against the Holy Ghost. Nothing about it is said when those sins are enumerated, which disqualify a man for the Kingdom of Heaven.

As, in denunciations against sins, it is generally understood, that the punishment is to take place except men repent; there may be no sufficient reason why the same exception should not be allowed with regard to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; if that be the case, the formidable text Matt. xii. 31. and its parallels, are no more against the efficacy of repentance, than any others. To make final impenitence the sin against the Holy Ghost, seems unsatisfactory, (Sect. 1v.) because that is no sin: it is only not deserting sins, without dis-

tinction.

The practical part of this subject is, to be very cautious of acting as the Pharisees did, whom our Saviour reproved, or in any manner resembling, or approaching to their conduct. Though a Christian cannot impute the miracles of Christ or his Apostles to Demons; yet some, to whom Christianity is daily offered, and some nominal Christians, may shew a greater,

m 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.—Gal. v. 21.—Eph. v. 5.—add 1 John v. 16.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xii. 31, 32.—Mark iii. 28. and Luke xii. 10. as mentioned in Sect. 1v.

n See Hammond on Matt. xii. 31.

482 BOOK IV. ART. XVI. SECT. XXXV—XXXVII. greater, or less attention and respect to the proofs of its divine authority.

At length we come to our Application.

xxxv. The Application may confift of the same parts as before.

A Form somewhat analogous to our Article might

be used in natural religion.

'As it is the purpose of religious Association to procure a continuance and improvement in virtue, and as institutions ordinarily answer their ends; men may fall into a way of speaking, as if those who were affociated on religious principles, would of course persevere in good living, and in the favour And some, perhaps partly as fatalists, have held, that true virtue, once acquired, cannot be lost. Yet, such are the temptations incident to human life, that this is rather a subject of hope than of certainty. However, if a man, in such a state of improvement, does fall into any great fins, his only wisdom is to repent and amend his life.— How far his repentance may be accepted, he may not certainly know; but there is a good probability, that he may be forgiven o; and a very strong one, that his repentance may prove greatly beneficial to him.'

XXXVI. A Christian may fay,

'Christianity is an excellent plan for perpetuating virtue and happiness; yet those, who are engaged in it, must not be secure: each Christian may fall from the favour of God; but his fall will not prevent his regaining the divine savour, if he truly repent, on the genuine principles of his religion.'

either with the advocates of the doctrine of Perseverance,

o Div. Leg. B. ix. p. 652, quarto.

verance, or with Novatians. Or indeed they might take place with such as maintain the doctrine of Assurances, or with such as make all heinous sins on a footing with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

To the advocates of the doctrine of Perseverance we might say, that the doctrine cannot be a reasonable ground of schism or dissension, because it has never been inserted into Creeds q, or any confessions of Faith, which were to be used by all members of the Church.

We might moreover inquire, whether they and we have, in reality, such material difference of opinion between us, as may seem on first ap-

pearance?

They think, God causes our Perseverance; we say, that our Perseverance should be ascribed to God; though, as neither of us see his operations distinctly, it should be ascribed indistinctly; and we say, with their esteemed Augustin, that it should

be ascribed after the event.

Both parties own the same facts: a Christian falls into wickedness; he repents, or he does not repent: if he does repent, we say, he has departed from Grace, but by the Grace of God he rises again, and amends his life:—They say he is one truly justified, (or elected); he was overcome by sin for a time, but never lost the favour of God; he perseveres sinally. If the man does not repent, we say, he was a real Christian, but has fallen away;

9 See Baxter on Perseverance, page 18. 23.

P For this name, fee our Homily on Repentance, page 418, 8vo. and Sect. 111. of this Article.

r If the Calvinists had not understood our departing from Grace and rising again, as equivalent to their final Perseverance, I do not see how they could have subscribed to this Article.

away; they would fay, that he never was truly justified (or elected); but then of this they judge by the event as well as we.—" The house" says Baxter, (alluding to Matt. vii. 26.) "that falleth when the winds arise and the storms affault it, was never built upon the rock, but upon the fands." His idea is, indeed, that fomething has been different in the good and bad, from the beginning; fundamentally; we cannot fay, that it has not; but the opinion, that it has, cannot be applied to practice. We are ignorant of the beginning, therefore both parties must exert themselves as uncertain; as if all depended on themselves; and, if they form any judgment of the state of any particular men, they can only do it, by reasoning à posteriori; from their conduct as an effect, to the divine will as a cause.

As to the advocates for Assurance, if the "assured and infallible' hope" of our Homily, will not coalesce with their qualified and wavering certainty, I know not what to say. Would they accept of the expedient of the Bishops and Divines, who gave a judgment on the Lambeth Articles, and proposed substituting for certitudo, the original Greek word Plerophoria in Latin

letters?

If time permits, I will here read Baxter's Prop.

v. in his Essay on Perseverance, p. 16, & 17.

To the Novatians, of ancient or modern times, I have very little to fay. Severity is respectable, though it be not amiable; concessions must depend upon the effects of it: as, on the one hand, dissembling with great sinners may seem to be treachery

5 On Perseverance, page 33.

\* Mentioned Sect. vii.

Homily on Repentance, p. 419, 8vo mentioned in Sect. x.

u I think one may call it fo; see the notes to Dr. Rutherforth's 3d Charge.

BOOK IV. ART. XVI. SECT. XXXVIII. 485

treachery to pure religion, and prefumption in making ourselves judges of the execution of the laws of God; so, on the other hand, it seems a duty to aim at the greatest possible good. Severity may disappoint itself; and to proceed in reforming by a mild discipline, improving gradually, seems acting in the most rational manner; in a manner most conformable to the Spirit, the precepts, and the models of Christianity.

Those who sayour the notion, that all great sins are sins against the Holy Ghost, in such a way as to come under Matt. xii. 31, (and parallel places) are so sew in number, and so little respectable, that it seems needless to try to hit upon any compromise with them: if indeed any such persons there be, at

this time.

be allowed to wish, that, in the words of the Article, all mention of sin against the Holy Ghost were omitted; which would remove the inconsistency between not every sin, and no sin.—Perhaps the doctrine of Assurance, should be more clearly expressed, or not at all.—And it would be best to have both remission of sins mentioned, and absolution. I will only add, that it would be a very great improvement indeed, if men would learn to construe eloquence rhetorically, and popular language popularly: but this belongs equally to the seventeenth Article.



## ARTICLE XVII.

## OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

REDESTINATION to Life, is the everlaftl ing purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due feason: they through Grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made fons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotton Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is sull of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the Works of the slesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their saith of eternal Salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God; so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have con-

tinually

tinually before their eyes the sentence of God's predeffination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in fuch wife, as they be generally fet forth to us in holy Scripture: And in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly de-

clared unto us in the Word of God.

This being one of those Articles, against which men are apt to be prejudiced, I will give a general idea of it, by way of Preface or Introduction. To my own mind it does not present so many difficulties, as that which we have last confidered. In speaking of it to others, the chief perplexity, of which I am sensible, is that arising from an endeavour to give the right value to words, which are not intended to have a precise

and literal meaning.

Many texts occur in Scripture, which convey an idea of God's predetermining events; to think, that he really intends to admit us into his Counfels, is ridiculous: yet no text is to be neglected; what is to be done?—Draw out these texts, connect them, form them into a feries: then ask, in what light are they to be confidered? not as affording us any rule of conduct; what they tell us is concerning the part of God; all our morality must be fettled before we meddle with any of them: as far as they can be ferviceable to virtue, previously fettled, we may use them, but no farther; and we only can be the judges. Nay, what they tell us of the Government of God, is so faint and indistinct. indistinct, that we cannot make of it even speculative propositions, to be understood in a strict and absolute sense; nor need we suppose the Sacred writers themselves to have understood these texts more distinctly. They have all the impersections which have been described as incident to popular language, when used about things Divine.—Have these texts then no use? yes; but it is to the Heart, and not to the Head: each text was originally introduced in such a manner, as to produce some good and pious sentiment; so as to warm and raise the heart to holy gratitude, admiration, devotion; and they should always be used for that purpose, and that purpose only.

Suppose a man previously good, they will animate and comfort him; but no bad man must use them; they would make him worse; he would use them too literally; that is, he would pervert them. The applying of them must be guided entirely by the good they seem likely to do. This could not be the case if we understood the texts; if the propositions they seem to contain, were level to the apprehensions of man; then one man might use them as well as another; the bad as well as the good. Speculative truths, properly so called, are truths as much to the bad as to the good; but instruments, or weapons, will, in the hand of a good man, be useful, in the hand of a bad man, hurtful.

As to our conduct, that (our morality having been previously settled) must all proceed upon the *Promises* of God. All promises suppose those at *Liberty*, to whom they are made: and therefore God's promises would contradict his decrees, were what are called his decrees, strictly and properly such; and were they persectly understood by us.—

Intimations

Introd. to fecond Part of the Articles, Sect. x1.

Intimations of his decrees, or indistinct referring of events to them, may give us some idea of what God permits; but, in our conduct, we are not to do what he permits, but what he wishes to have done; in our conduct, we are not to study what is faintly intimated, but what is plainly expressed.

If any one was to hear this faid without any reference to any Article, I should think he would hesitate little about it.—And I hope to make it appear, that our Article ought not to convey any

other idea. - But to begin with History.

our present doctrine and the doctrines of some preceding Articles, especially the tenth, that a good deal has been already said, which might have been said here. If therefore we seem to mention any persons or events without sufficient clearness, or fullness of description, it may be, because a suller account of them has been given before.

In all ages of the world, men have had ideas of referring events to Fate; and Philosophers have been led from fayings of common life concerning fate, into metaphyfical speculations. Human knowledge being very indistinct on this matter, thinking men have fallen into various opinions, or rather conceptions; but when these have been opposed, diffensions, in different ages, as springing from the fame causes, have nearly resembled each other; they have varied more in circumftances than in effence. Indeed all diffensions respecting fate, destiny, &c. have sprung from different modes of adjusting the wisdom of God with the freedom of Man. Milton puts together, fixt-fate, freewill, foreknowledge absolute, as causing perplexity even

even in beings superior to man<sup>b</sup>. The Stoics were fatalists; the Epicureans<sup>c</sup> were of an opposite turn.

—Cicero, in his Book de Fato, gives some account of the different ways, in which different Philosophers reasoned<sup>d</sup>. And those ancient authors, who have related or imitated the incidents of common life, have left us passages referring events to sate<sup>c</sup> and the decrees of the Gods<sup>f</sup>.

Mr. Hume observes, that the subject "has been found hitherto to exceed all the s skill of Philosophy."

worthy of our attention, as expressions of the New Testament are accommodated to them; but they have been already mentioned. The fifth Chapter of Maimonides de Penitentia is more applicable in this place, than under the tenth Article.—The phraseology of the Jews, as being remarkable for referring events to God, has been mentioned repeatedly.—An idea always to be kept in mind is, that the *Pharises* were a fort of Stoics, and the Sadducees a fort of Epicureans.

1v. The Christians before the fifth Century seem rather to introduce texts of Scripture, than to form doctrines out of them. They have been thought

page 85. a passage of Agathias, which mentions as a common notion, that wars are owing to the stars, or fate.

c Calvin calls his adversaries Epicureans, Inft. 3. 23. 8.

d In the Book de Divinatione, there are many things concerning Fate, &c.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>e</sup> Homer Il. Ω. 209, 210. — Plautus, Aulularia, Act 4. Scene 10. Deus impulsor mihi fuit, &c.

f See a story of Dox and Fox in Dr. Musgrave's Dissertation on the Grecian Mythology, page 37, 38.—Consult Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon under DNJ.

E End of Essay on Liberty and Necessity.

h Art. x. Sect. III. — Art. xI. Sect. I.
i Art. x. Sect. III. & L. with references.

to hold much the same opinions about Predestination, with the Arminians of later days; neither neglecting divine nor human agency. They conceived, that God elected or predestined men to future happiness, foreseeing their sidelity in making a good use of the privilege k.—But it is Controversy, which makes doctrines definite1: that is, which shews what it is that each man holds.

v. In the fifth Century, the Pelagian controverfy, fet people on thinking and examining; though Predestination was only an incidental, not the original or principal subject of that controverfy m, which was, the power of Man to work out his own Salvation. Augustin's opinion of Predestination has been differently represented: my own idea of it is this. He took the texts of scripture, on which the doctrine of Predestination is built, in too literal a fense; but infifted on that fense chiefly because his adversaries, the Pelagians, tried to evade it, without giving any fufficient scriptural reason. He saw, that there must be fomething professed about Predestination and Election; but whatever it should be, he never meant it to interfere with the duties of individuals; with their Love of God and Man; with their Fear of God and themselves; nor with moral diligence. (See Art. xvi. Sect. vi.) He faid plainly, that no one could distinguish between n one of the elect and any other person; nor could any man know whether he himself was one of the elect or not: he held, that God left man in this ignorance, in order to make him fear, and to prevent his falling

k Baxter on Perseverance, 2d Opinion. - Vossii Hist. Pel. Lib. 6. Thesis 8.

<sup>1</sup> Art 1. Sect. Iv.

m Vossius, page 761. Lib. 6, Thesis 16.

De Corr. et Gratia, cap. 13 —See Baxter, Persev. page 7.

Whether his notions were reconcileable with each other, or not, he left men, for practice, just as the earlier Fathers had done; as much depending upon their free-will. So that it is most probable he did not, at different times, hold what could be properly called different opinions concerning free-will, but, by controversies with Manicheans and Pelagians, was led into two different ways of expressing himself; which is also Bp. Overal's popinion. As he wished both free-will and Grace to be allowed, and Predestination as a preparation of Grace, he must, of course, defend any one of them against those, who wanted to set it aside.

His change of conception, as to the theory of Predestination, is mentioned in his Book de Prædestinatione Sanctorum, cap. 3.—But it only amounts to this; that he once thought the preserve given to Jacob over Esau, was a reward to Jacob's fidelity, (which God foreknew); but afterwards, he thought the Scriptures represented that preserve as purely a favour; and no reward.—For his change about Grace, see Art. x. Sect. vi.—He seems to have written to the Monks of Adrumetum in defence of free-will, in some sense; that is, proving, that neither Grace was to superfede free-will, nor free-will Grace. He owns the subject to be very difficult.—His ideas of Predestination and Virtue seem to have been of the same sort:

P Page 8. F-15-11. Camb. Hist Art. Lamb. " neque tam sententiam se (Augustinum) tunc mutasse, quam loquendi genus."

In the Byzacene, not far from Augustin's Diocese. - De Gratia et libero Arbitrio: the Letter prefixed to Valentinus, shews this plainly.

o In the English, "Wretchlesses."—De Correptione et Gratia, cap. 13 He says we should love all men; we do not know who are the elect.

fort; neither was to fet afide the other, though we could not reconcile them. A method which I have commended before repeatedly.

Fulgentius and Prosper supported Augustin.— The Greek fathers were never great Predestinarians. Their sending Petrus Diaconus was as much upon our present subject, as on that of the tenth Article.

The principal question agitated in the Christian church was, did God elect men, and make them virtuous, &c.—or did he elect them because of their virtue? that is, because he foresaw they would be virtuous?—the former fort of election was called absolute, the latter, conditional". And this seems always likely to be the principal question while there is any .- Abfolute predestination, election, decree, would be conceived to be made for promoting the Glory of God; or, from his good pleasure: and it would be called the cause of Virtue; as virtue would be called the cause of conditional election.— It was also a question, whether the number of elect was limited: many feem to have been inclined to maintain some predestination to happiness, and none to mifery. (Not unlike the compilers of our Article.)—Moreover, disputes arose about the confequences of the doctrine of Predestination, as to God, and as to Man; whether it proved God to be partial, unjust, cruel, &c. or man incapable of exhortation.

Page 1. Rhemists on Rom. viii. 30. feem to hold this opinion.

Art. x. Sect. xi. xLvi. and Art. xvi. Sect. xxxiii.

t Art. x. Sect. vii.

u Whitby speaks of "a conditional election upon our Perfeverance in a life of Holiness." Five Points, page 36. And this is all the Election he allows: and this was once my idea of conditional: and then I called the kind of conditional mentioned above, intermediate; between absolute and Whitby's conditional; and media scientia occurred to my mind.

exhortation, reproof, (correption), &c. and what rules of prudence and referve should be commonly

followed in teaching the doctrine.

The Pelagians seem to me not to have entered into the subject of Predestination; they declare indeed against any man's being forced to fin by necessity; but that declaration was made with respect to Original fin, and the possibility of keeping God's commandments: subjects already treated under our ninth and fifteenth Articles .- In Aug. de Predestinatione Sanctorum, you find it said what the Pelagians hold \*; but I think Augustin means by Pelagians, what we call Semipelagians; for that Book, and the following, De Dono Perfeverantiæ (which has been called the fecond book de Prædestinatione Sanctorum) are both written to the French Prelates, Prosper and Hilary, in answer to reasonings which had been sent to Augustin (in Africa, I suppose,) by them: reasonings which were prevalent at Marfeilles, the mart of Semipelagians, and had spread into different parts of France. - I do not see anything about Predestination in Pelagius's Creed fent to Innocent; nor in that ascribed to Julianus2.—The dispute about Predestination was incidental, as just now mentioned; and Augustin did not write his, Book de Predestinatione Sanctorum, seemingly, till about twelve or thirteen years after the death of Innocent. Indeed Augustin seems to me to have said but little upon Predestination; considering how much noise his favings have made: he considered it chiefly as the Christian dispensation viewed in the

<sup>\*</sup> Aug. de Prædest. Sanct. cap. 19. Opera Edit. Benedict. Tom. 10. page 539.

y Art. x. Sect. viii.

2 See 2d Appendix to 10th Vol. of Augustin's Works, Ed.

Bened. page 64 and 74.

the foreknowledge and predetermination of God:

he calls it praparatio Gratia.

vi. The Semipelagians seem to have thought just as Augustin did in the former part of his life, when he published his Opuscula; that is, that those, who were elected by God, were favoured on account of their good disposition, or faith and considence in him. They thought moreover, that the number of the elect was not limited; and they had a notion, that such as died Infants a would be rewarded or punished in a future life, according to the conduct which they would have observed had they lived on to maturity.

The Mohammedans are reckoned great Fatalists;

but

fpoke of poor Gotescaled under the tenth Article. The transactions most to our present purpose passed after he had been entirely subdued, and had recanted his opinion. Then several churches in France with Remi (or Remigius) Bishop of Lyons at their head, undertook to defend his cause and his doctrine. They held Councils, and wrote Epistles. The Epistle of the Church of Lyons (Ecclesia Lugdunensis) is one of the principal defences of Predestination. It, amongst other things, tries to settle the difference between Prescience and Predestination;

Iı

a Art. 1x. Sect. 1x.

b For these notions, see Hilary's Letter to Augustin, which is sometimes prefixed to his Book De Prædestinatione Sanctorum. Vol. 10. p. 519. Ed. Bened. and de Prædest. Sanctorum, cap. 12.

e See in Usher's Book about him, his two confessions. — In Sirmond's Opuscula, Vol. 3, at the beginning, there are two sentences against him: one of them in the form of a Synodic Epistle. —In Mosheim, Cent. 9. 2. 3. 24, we see what a great deal has been written about this poor Monk, and the contests he occasioned.

Predestination; that is, between knowing what would happen, and determining what should happen.—The distinction was not then new; it is in Augustins: predestinarians are glad to have recourse to it, as it helps them to defend themselves against the charge of making God the Author of Sin. They can, by means of such a distinction, allow his foreknowing sin, and deny his causing it.—There seems an inconsistency in several writers, in making the decrees of God absolute, and yet, at the same time, an exercise of the divine suffice in punishing.

viii. If we looked into the writings of the Schoolmen, we should find, that, before the schoolmen, we should find, that, before the school lastic ages, and during them, the notions of Predestination had been growing stronger. The intricacies, which that doctrine brings into discussion, suited the Schoolmen. Bishop Burnet on this Article may furnish some instances. I could content myself with referring, as in the tenth Article, to one of Thomas Aquinas's Indexes.—The same differences, which prevailed between the Thomists and Scotists, the Dominicans and Franciscans, about Grace, prevailed also about Predestination.

1x. Let us then pass to the age of the Reformation: taking first the early Reformers, without regard to Country, and mentioning the Council of Trent, as composed of persons from different countries;

f De Præd. Sanct. cap. 10.

See Fulke's Rhemish Testament, on parts of Rom. ix.— See also expressions of Calvin in Diss. on this Article.—Baret owns, or is made to own, that Sin is not the cause of Reprobation, but that "the reprobation of the wicked is from everlassing."

h At Lecture I read two Heads out of the Index to the works of Thomas Aquinas; beginning, Prædestinatio juvatur precibus fanctorum, &c. and Præscientia meritorum non est causa, &c.

Art. XI. Sect. X.

countries; and then, as in the tenth Article, let us take accounts of our doctrine as professed in different countries, without keeping to one time.

At the beginning of the Reformation, the first opposition was to popish good works1. This occasioned great stress to be laid upon every part of Divine Agency. Wickliffe was a predestinarian "; and so were other able Reformers; Zuingle, Calvin, and at first, Martin Luther; though he afterwards softened"; but Calvin continued in his first rigour, and his follower Beza increased upon it. might read Calvin's definition of Predestination. -Dr. Balguy calls his fystem "nonsense;" and his religion, "a religion which feems to have refted on this execrable foundation, that God is a Ty-Why elfe did its teachers delight to represent rant. him as governing by Will only, not by wisdom ?"? -The Zuinglians held, "For Predeftination and Reprobation; that man doth nothing, but all is in the Will of God." But Melancthon wholly omitted the subject of Predestination in the Confession of Augsburg And the Saxon confession declines it.

Before the Council of Trent, we are told, that the Romanists were inclined to what has fince been called

k Art. x. Sect. x111. 1 Art. x1. Sect. v1.

m Hume's Hist. England.—Gilpin's Life of Wickliffe,

page 80.

Burnet Hist. Ref. Vol. 2. page 107, quoted in Oxford pamphlet, page 27.—I beg leave to call by that short name, or even the shorter one of Oxf. the Differtation on the Seventeenth Article printed at Oxford in 1773, which I have heard was written by Dr. Winchester.

<sup>°</sup> Calvin's Institutes 3. 21. 5.

P Heylin Quinq. Hist. page 510.

9 See his idea of the matter in the Aug. Conf. cap. 5. de Fide. quoted in Oxf. page 31.—Heylin, page 519.—Syntagma, page 21.

Syntagma, page 84, (2d paging).

Predestination; that is, between knowing what would happen, and determining what should happen.—The distinction was not then new; it is in Augustin': predestinarians are glad to have recourse to it, as it helps them to defend themselves against the charge of making God the Author of Sin. They can, by means of such a distinction, allow his foreknowing sin, and deny his causing it.—There seems an inconsistency in several writers, in making the decrees of God absolute, and yet, at the same time, an exercise of the divine syntice in punishing.

viii. If we looked into the writings of the Schoolmen, we should find, that, before the schoolastic ages, and during them, the notions of Predestination had been growing stronger. The intricacies, which that doctrine brings into discussion, suited the Schoolmen. Bishop Burnet on this Article may furnish some instances. I could content myself with referring, as in the tenth Article, to one of Thomas Aquinas's Indexes.—The same differences, which prevailed between the Thomists and Scotists, the Dominicans and Franciscans, about Grace, prevailed also about Predestination.

mation: taking first the early Reformers, without regard to Country, and mentioning the Council of Trent, as composed of persons from different countries;

f De Præd. Sanct. cap. 10.

See Fulke's Rhemish Testament, on parts of Rom. ix.— See also expressions of Calvin in Diss. on this Article.—Baret owns, or is made to own, that Sin is not the cause of Reprobation, but that "the reprobation of the wicked is from everlassing."

At Lecture I read two Heads out of the Index to the works of Thomas Aquinas; beginning, Prædestinatio juvatur precibus fanctorum, &c. and Præscientia meritorum non est causa, &c.

Art. xI. Sect. x.

countries; and then, as in the tenth Article k, let us take accounts of our doctrine as professed in different countries, without keeping to one time.

At the beginning of the Reformation, the first opposition was to populh good works. This occasioned great stress to be laid upon every part of Divine Agency. Wickliffe was a predestinarian "; and so were other able Reformers; Zuingle, Calvin, and at first, Martin Luther; though he afterwards softened"; but Calvin continued in his first rigour, and his follower Beza increased upon it. might read Calvin's definition of Predestination. -Dr. Balguy calls his fystem "nonsense;" and his religion, "a religion which feems to have refted on this execrable foundation, that God is a Tyrant. Why elfe did its teachers delight to represent him as governing by Will only, not by wisdom?"? -The Zuinglians held, "For Predestination and Reprobation; that man doth nothing, but all is in the Will of God." But Melancthon wholly omitted the subject of Predestination in the Confession of Augsburg<sup>9</sup>. And the Saxon<sup>r</sup> confession declines it.

Before the Council of Trent, we are told, that the Romanists were inclined to what has fince been called

k Art. x. Sect. x111. 1 Art. x1. Sect. v1.

m Hume's Hist. England.—Gilpin's Life of Wickliffe,

page 80.

n Burnet Hist. Ref. Vol. 2. page 107, quoted in Oxford pamphlet, page 27.—I beg leave to call by that short name, or even the shorter one of Oxf. the Differtation on the Seventeenth Article printed at Oxford in 1773, which I have heard was written by Dr. Winchester.

<sup>°</sup> Calvin's Institutes 3. 21. 5.

P Heylin Quinq. Hist. page 510.

9 See his idea of the matter in the Aug. Conf. cap. 5. de Fide. quoted in Oxf. page 31.—Heylin, page 519.—Syntagma, page 21.

Syntagma, page 84, (2d paging).

called Calvinism': which, considering their veneration for Augustin and the Schoolmen, is very probable in itself; though different parties would fall into it in different degrees'.—At the Council of Trent, the Dominicans were for referring all to God, and laying down, that what relates to man, his conduct and his welfare, has been fixed and decided before all worlds. The Franciscans wished to have it declared, that all is in the power of man: a third fort took a middle way, and would have some things declared to be fixed, others to be left to human choice and endeavours. -Luther and Melancthon passed uncensured in this matter. The refult we find in the Canons and decrees of the Council. From the fifteenth and feventeenth Canons, and the twelfth Chapter of the Decree, we gather, as I should express it, that the Romanists did not deny the reality of Predestination, but condemned every thing, by which a man could apply it to practice; or to his own particular case.

The Rhemists on Rom. viii. and ix. follow Augustin, and are for unconditional predestination; but are not so decided, with regard to the motive of God, or with regard to reprobation, as their answerer Master Fulke

x. We now take a fhort view of Predestination in different countries; leaving our own for the last.

Of Spain\* and the Jesuit Molina, I seem to have nothing new to advance: he is said to have invented the Media Scientia, by which God sees whatsoever

Dean Tucker's Letters to Dr. Kippis, page 81, &c. quoted Oxf. page 79.

Art. xvi. Sect. viii.

<sup>&</sup>quot; See Heylin from Father Paul, page 510.

<sup>\*</sup> Art. x. Sect. xiv.

Flanders, I have already faid all that is needful; only I may read the decrees of the Synod of Dort as far as they relate to Predestination. The English divines were ordered by King James the First to vote for universal redemption; but they were out-voted.

I have heard, I think, that Calvinism is now the ruling religion in Holland, but that Arminianism is tolerated. Limborch was an Arminian, but he read Divinity Lectures in public at Amsterdam, and his body of Divinity was published there: he died in 1712, aged 79.

xII. Of Germany I have said something under the tenth Article. The Calvinists and Arminians are there mixed with Romanists; the different religions prevailing in different degrees in different places. The Lutherans do not, I believe, differ much from the Romanists, or from us, with regard to Predestination.

xIII. The disturbances in France did not regard the doctrine of Grace only: the propositions condemned were five. The last is against the universality of Redemption: and therefore favours, at least, the doctrine of Predestination.

xiv. We will take the early Socinians as belonging to Poland; as we did before. In the Racovian Catechism, in the Chapter De libero Arbitrio, we have the Socinian definition of Predestination.

y Burnet on the Article, octavo, page 195.

z Art. x. Sect. xv.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Art. x. Sect. xvII. b Art. x. Sect. xvIII.

Mosheim, Cent. 17. 2. 1. 1. 43.

d Art. x. Sect. xvII. though there is a Confessio Polonica in the Syntagma; but the Socinians are called Fratres Poloni.

deftination. - " Prædestinatio Dei in scripturis aliud nihil notat, quam Dei, ante conditum mundum, de hominibus decretum ejusmodi; Quòd iis, qui in ipsum crederent, eique obedirent, daturus effet vitam æternam: eos verò qui in eum credere, et ei parere, recusarent, æterna damnatione puniturus effet."-Afterwards it is faid, that Election sometimes means the same as Vocation, sometimes it implies farther, leading a Christian life.— The Socinians have been, I think fometimes faid to deny the Divine Prescience; perhaps it might be thought, that they deny it in this passage; but I should rather say, they do not profess it; if God decrees to reward those, who should believe in him, he may foreknow who will believe in him, though that be not mentioned.

xv. Geneva used to be the principal mart of Calvinism; there Calvin flourished, and Beza taught.

—The Helvetic confession says, all those are reprobate, who are not Christians, though it hopes well of all, and takes pains to prevent abuse.—
But I have been informed, that Calvinism is now a mere form at Geneva; and that Ostervald's Catechism is chiefly taught. I believe Ostervald was a Lutheran. I have already, in the third book, mentioned this change as an instance of a tacit Reformation.

The Jesuits h are reckoned Semi-Pelagians.

There is a comic dialogue called Fur pradestinatus, which exposes the principal predestinarian opinions down to the Synod of Dort.

ary Doctrine has fomething very like our Article;

P. S. See Burnet on this Article, near the beginning, page 190, octavo.

Book III. Chap. Iv. Sect. vI. h Art. x. Sect. xIII.
In the Article of Justificacion, about four pages from the end.

what one might call the feeds of it.—" And here all phantastical imaginacion, curious reasonyning, and vayn truste of predestinacion, is to be laied apart. And according to the playne manner of speaking and teaching of scripture, in innumerable places, we oughte evermore to be in dread of our own frailtie and natural pronitie to fall to synne, and not to assure ourselse, that we be elected any otherwise, than by felyng of scriptural mocions in our herte, and by the tokens of good and vertuous lyving, in solowinge the grace of God, and persevering in the same to the ende."

In the Reformatio Legum, predestination is the last subject of the part de Hæresibus; it mentions as a fact, that many did, at the time, use the plea of predestination, as an excuse for their immoral lives: but it does not seem to hint at any penalties for such abuse. It is more of a declaration or memorial, to prevent scandal and perversion, than a Law. No more need be said upon it at present, as

it will be useful in our explanation.

In our Homilies I do not see the doctrine of Predestination treated; If I have not overlooked any passages concerning it, we might conclude, that our church did not think it a doctrine to be commonly

taught to the people.

The principal writers at the time of the Reformation in England, Cranmer, Latimer, Hooper, Ridley, are extremely rational in treating our doctrine: specimens may be seen in Heylin's Historia Quinquarticularis and the Oxford Dissertation: my own opinion was formed and publicly delivered before I knew theirs; and I was happy to find the best and ablest men giving me the most support;

From Heylin, Quinq. page 558 (2.9.7.) one would think that our Homilies did mention the doctrine; but the Italics denoting quotation are continued too long.—That work of Heylin's is incorrectly printed.

and making my ideas feem most like those of the

Church of England.

It feems clear to me, that our Church did not, at the time of the separation from the Church of Rome, properly intend to lay down any dostrine of Predestination; but only to declare against abuses actually prevailing. If it had not been for this, they would probably have followed the example of Melancthon, when he formed the confession of Augsburg. The opinions of Erasmus confirm this, as he was far from a rigorous Predestinarian; and yet they were considered as proper to help forward the Reformation in England. His paraphrase on the New Testament was placed by authority in our churches; and the Clergy were put upon studying his works.—He died in 1536, aged 68.

1 Introduction to Book IV. Sect. IV.

END OF THE THIRD VOLUME.



